

2004

# Access to Higher Education in Florida and South Africa: A Comparative Policy Analysis

Marty Z. Khan  
*University of North Florida*

---

## Suggested Citation

Khan, Marty Z., "Access to Higher Education in Florida and South Africa: A Comparative Policy Analysis" (2004). *UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 306.  
<https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/etd/306>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at UNF Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UNF Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [Digital Projects](#).  
© 2004 All Rights Reserved

Access to Higher Education in Florida and South Africa:  
A Comparative Policy Analysis

by

Marty Z. Khan

A dissertation submitted to the Doctoral Program Faculty in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Educational Leadership

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

May, 2004

Unpublished work © 2004 Marty Z. Khan

The dissertation of Marty Khan is approved:

(date)

**Signature Deleted**

06/05/04

**Signature Deleted**

06/05/04

**Signature Deleted**

04/05/04

**Signature Deleted**

04-05-04

Committee Chairperson

Accepted for the Department:

**Signature Deleted**

June 1, 2004

Chair

Accepted for the College:

**Signature Deleted**

June 1, 2004

Dean, College of Education & Human Services

Accepted for the University:

**Signature Deleted**

6-9-04

Graduate Dean

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The successful completion of this dissertation would not have been possible without the support of many of my professors, friends and family members. The research and writing was a lengthy process—one where I saw clearly how caring professors shared their valuable time and made an uncommon commitment to inspire and guide me in this long and often lonely journey.

My deepest gratitude goes to all my committee members—to each of them I am indebted—because this dissertation would not have been completed without their help and mentorship.

First, I am deeply appreciative to Dr. Charles Galloway in agreeing to serve as my Chair and take the lead role while Dr. Hodge was on sabbatical. Dr. Galloway's enthusiasm for my research topic was evident from our first meeting. He was an inspiration—he was very, very gracious with his time even though he had a demanding schedule. He offered numerous suggestions to strengthen my dissertation and to bring out the salient issues that would be of value to educators and policy-makers. His wisdom and encouragement to me along the way were extraordinary and I will always be grateful to him. His sharing of stories, about his career, his family and his life made me feel he wanted to be on my team and that he enjoyed my company. In my Asian culture, people customarily bow to show respect. Dr. Galloway, I bow to you.

Second, the support and counsel I received from my other three committee members were critical links in the foundation of my research. They were: Dr. Henry Thomas for always sharing his time and insight during our numerous discussions on policy issues in his office, in the hallway and on campus—his suggestions and

mentorship were invaluable. Dr. Steven Paulson for sharing his time on many occasions to always offer kind words of support, other perspectives and ideas and most of all, the encouragement to me to do my research. Dr. Aline Stomfay-Stitz for her graciousness to share her time and her personal professional resources in a good-hearted way. Her unquestioned support and commitment as a mentor to me was complemented with her many introductions to several of her colleagues and friends in many countries doing research in peace education and policy issues. Köszönöm, Dr. Stomfay-Stitz.

Third, I wish to acknowledge Dr. Warren Hodge for his guidance that was helpful to frame and complete my proposal. Again, to all my committee members, my sincere thanks.

A special note of thanks is due to all my professors in my program: Paul Eggen, David Fenner, Deborah Inman, Joyce Jones, Katherine Kasten, Elinor Scheirer, Pritchey Smith, Kenneth Wilburn, David Wiles, Jon Wiles, and Bill Wilson.

A special note of thanks to Kern Alexander, David Colburn, James Collom, Mathew Corrigan, Larry Daniel, Ahmed Essop, Betty Flinchum, Steve Fourie, David Kline, Janice Seabrooks, Frances Vandiver, Anita Vorreyer-Hedges, David Woods and Charles Young who shared their valuable time and offered advice and support along the way.

Also, I would like to thank Dr. and Professor Vernon Vandiver (Colonel, US Air Force, Retired), Dr. and Professor Charles MacDonald (Colonel, US Air Force, Retired), Giles Light (Colonel US Air Force, Retired), and Thomas Nickerson (Colonel, US Army, Retired) for their steadfast encouragement, leadership and support to me from day one of this endeavor.

My sincere thanks to Ty Arnold, Scott Bennett, Gary Clark, Sohrab Fracis, Dieter and Dagmar Haussler, Sheila Heim, Ron Jones, Marylee McGregor, Patti Robbins, Konrad, Gisela and Christine Schrooten, Mary Taylor, Linda Walters and all the reference librarians at the University of North Florida's library (especially, Alisa Craddock, Mary Davis, Bruce Latimer and Barbara Tuck), and all my friends from Cohort 8 of the Educational Leadership Doctoral Program. To my new South African friends (Mpikazi Kanti, Viwe Mzila and Belinda Tudge) I wish to offer special thanks for their kinds words of support.

My profound gratitude to my father, Yusuf Khan, and my mother, Amna Khan and other members of my family for their encouragement during the entire program and for their support during my earlier years that gave me the foundation to successfully complete this program.

A special note of thanks to my grandmother, Halima Mirza—the oldest member of my family—for her strong words of support and encouragement to me while pursuing my educational goal. Her wit and wisdom inspired me during my study. And to my uncles, Jaleel and Jameel Rahman, much appreciation for your mentorship.

Lastly, the key person who provided the motivation and assurance through unquestioned endearment, fidelity, and proof reading as my wingman—around all sectors and around the clock from the start—was Rebecca Stein Handlee, my wife. To her, Ich sage—Mit viele Liebe—Wir müssen abwarten, was die Zukunft bringt. Prost, immer prost an der Freizeit.

My inspiration in completing my dissertation was Sir Ernest Henry Shackleton (1874-1922) who I believe was a true and inspiring leader. Shackleton commanded his ship, *Endurance*, on an expedition to the South Pole on August 8, 1914. Later, his ship was trapped and crushed by pack ice. His ordeal would last twenty months without communication to the outside world. His inspirational leadership saved **all** his men from the extreme cold, ice floes, leopard seal attacks and an incredible open boat journey—one of the greatest navigational feats in nautical history—for help. Shackleton’s family motto was *Fortitudine Vincimus*—“by endurance we conquer.”

Shackleton once said, “Optimism is true moral courage,” a tenet he lived by until his death in 1922.

This Doctoral Dissertation is Dedicated

To

Rosenknospe & Kieferbaum



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One: Introduction and Background .....	1
History of Higher Education in the United States .....	8
Legal Challenges .....	14
One Florida Initiative.....	21
History of Higher Education in the Republic of South Africa.....	23
South African National Education Plan.....	28
Statement of Purpose .....	31
Research Questions.....	31
Definitions of Terms .....	32
Significance of Study.....	33
Value of Research.....	34
Conclusion .....	35
Chapter Two: Review of Literature .....	36
Philosophical Framework .....	37
Policy Making.....	40
Supporting Relevant Research.....	42
Access Programs and Practices in the United States .....	42
Students' Disposition in the United States.....	49
Access Programs and Practices in South Africa .....	57
Students' Disposition in South Africa .....	59
Comparative Education.....	61

University Leadership through Policy Change .....	66
Conclusion .....	72
Chapter Three: Design and Methodology .....	74
Rationale for a Qualitative Approach .....	74
Site Selection .....	75
Purposeful Sampling Strategies .....	75
Researcher Role .....	76
Ethical Considerations .....	77
Data Collection Strategies.....	77
Qualitative Interviews.....	78
Data Analysis .....	80
Political Analysis .....	81
Content Analysis.....	82
Conclusion .....	86
Chapter Four: Presentation of Data.....	87
Introduction.....	87
Political Analysis .....	89
Content Analysis.....	90
Textural Summary .....	95
Textural Analysis.....	107
Comparing Florida and South Africa.....	121
Themes and Making Sense of Them.....	124
Access .....	125

Leadership.....	128
Policy .....	132
Conclusion .....	134
Chapter Five: Findings and Conclusions .....	135
Introduction.....	135
Findings.....	137
Summary: Major Outcomes.....	140
Implications — A Leadership Model — A Proposition .....	141
Recommendations for Further Research.....	143
Final Implications on Access to Higher Education.....	145
Study's Impact on the Researcher.....	149
Conclusion .....	150
Appendix A: One Florida Initiative .....	152
Appendix B: Summary of South African Education Plan .....	155
Appendix C: Significant Events in South African History .....	165
Appendix D: Major International Education Declarations .....	166
Appendix E: Informed Consent .....	167
Appendix F: Institutional Review Board Approval .....	168
Appendix G: Interview Questions Protocol.....	169
Appendix H: Coding Protocol .....	171
Appendix I: Interview Excerpts of President of University in Florida.....	174
Appendix J: Interview Excerpts of Provost of University in Florida .....	178
Appendix K: Interview Excerpts of South African Vice-Chancellor .....	182

Appendix L: Interview Excerpts of South African University Registrar .....	188
Appendix M: Interview Excerpts of South African Government Official .....	193
References.....	199
Vita.....	224

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Intercoder Percentage Agreement for the One Florida Initiative .....	93
Table 2: Intercoder Percentage Agreement for the South African Plan .....	93

## ABSTRACT

This study examines issues of access to higher education in Florida and South Africa. On November 9, 1999, the Governor of the State of Florida issued Executive Order 99-281 to establish the One Florida Initiative (OFI), which barred the use of race as a factor in university admissions. In South Africa, the government in February 2001 issued its National Plan for Higher Education (SANPHE). This plan outlined a framework to redress past inequities in the higher education system perpetuated by the former government's apartheid ideology. Senior university leaders in Florida and South Africa were required to implement their respective policy.

The purpose of the study investigates two research questions:

1. What were the assumptions and political processes that contributed to the establishment of OFI and SANPHE policies?
2. How did the leadership at selected institutions implement OFI and SANPHE policies?

Using a qualitative methodology and focused interviews with senior leaders at two universities in Florida and South Africa, this study discusses the challenges and conflicts the leaders faced in implementing their respective policy. The challenges and conflicts included those of university governance, decision-making, leadership style, diversity, affirmative action and policy making. It discusses the unique ways of implementing a policy with which one might not agree and it provides a comparative understanding of challenges faced by university leaders in Florida and South Africa.

Five findings were noted from the data analysis. They are: Leaders must have steadfast philosophical beliefs about the need to broaden access for those who have been historically discriminated against; there must be an awareness of the value of affirmative action and diversity to an institution; participatory style of leadership is a characteristic common to all leaders; commitment to team dynamics was a persuasive attribute that the leaders practiced and the exercise of prudent discretion to implement a policy seemed to be an attribute that resonated with all the leaders. The study concluded with a proposition of a model to determine or to predict leadership effectiveness — referred to as the Belief/Action Leadership Style Model and recommendations of areas for further research in Florida and South Africa.

This study's results are useful for policy makers and senior leaders at higher education institutions.

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the reader to background information on the issue of access to higher education for those who have been traditionally discriminated against and to develop the overall context of the relevancy of this topic.

Access to higher education is not a new issue. Extensive research illustrates that it still remains a key leadership challenge for a country's domestic and international interests (Altbach, 1999; Berdahl, Altbach, & Gumport, 1999; Bowen & Bok, 1998; Callan, 2001; Davies, Hides, & Casey, 2001; Hy, 2000; Jewell, 2000; Jones, Yonezawa, Ballesteros, & Mehan, 2002; Rhodes, 2001; Shapiro, 1998). The scope of recent debates and discussions on access to higher education show how contentious and important access is.

On February 19, 2004, The Pathways to College Network, an alliance of thirty-four national organizations committed to improve college access, released its report, *A Shared Agenda: A Leadership Challenge to Improve College Access and Success* (Broida, 2004; Pathways to College Network, 2004). The Network reported that access to higher education is today more important. Because most jobs require some education, the government and policy makers should focus on those who are being left behind and do what is necessary to address the needs of low-income students (Pathways to College Network, 2004). Further, Carol Geary Schneider, president of the Association of



American Colleges and Universities stated at the release of *A Shared Agenda* that “College is no longer an elective—it is necessary” (Broida, 2004, p. 1). *A Shared Agenda* had nearly one hundred recommendations to increase access to higher education for all students (Broida, 2004).

Similarly, another organization reported on the importance of access to higher education. In October 2003, the Education Commission of the States issued its report, “*Closing the College Participation Gap: A National Summary*,” and pronounced that the “demand for postsecondary education and training is expected to increase substantially over the next decade as the full impact of demographic and economic forces is felt” (Ruppert, 2003, p.1). Moreover, the report noted that the challenge now for the nation [United States] is “to accommodate not only a greater number of students, but also to increase the proportion of the population that goes to college and successfully completes its learning goals” (Ruppert, 2003, p. 1).

In an era when higher education is receiving increased attention from policy makers, leaders within higher education are confronted with implementing policies that affect those who have been traditionally underrepresented in colleges and universities. Policy makers are faced with the politics of distributing scarce resources and deciding who will benefit from a governing authority’s decision-making (Downey, 1988; Dye, 2001; Eckel, 2001; Hy, 2000; Messick, 1999). Policy makers generally believe that education benefits the state and that these benefits exceed the costs (Downey, 1988; Dye, 2001; Hy, 2000; Shapiro, 1998). From a social perspective, “it is firmly believed an educated populace will reduce the occurrence of social maladies (e.g., crime, welfare, and

teen pregnancies) which in turn will lower the amount of money a state needs to spend on social programs” (Hy, 2000, p. 209).

As more and more jobs require a postsecondary education, the challenges and issues confronting policy makers and higher education leaders are about access and affordability by those who have been traditionally underrepresented in higher education (Eckel, 2001; Hurtado, Inkelas, Briggs, & Rhee, 1997; Hy, 2000). Additionally, as international trade grows and countries strive to compete in the market place, countries must remain competitive. And to remain competitive, policy makers will have to support higher education institutions to ensure that investments are made in a more strategic manner (Conklin & Reindl, 2004).

Historically, access to higher education has not been available to everyone in the United States (U.S.) and South Africa. In both countries, non-Whites and especially Blacks were virtually denied access to public institutions of higher education on the “belief of the intellectual inferiority of people of color” (Anderson, 2002, p. 4; Beck, 2000; Kgware 1978; Kruss 2001; Orfield & Whitley, 2001; Welsh & Savage, 1978; Woods, 1999). Much of the denial of access was based on the myth of intellectual inferiority and the “rationale that fused racism and meritocracy” (Anderson, 2002, p. 6; Beck, 2000; Kgware 1978; Kruss 2001; Welsh & Savage, 1978; Woods, 1999). The American Council on Education reported in its *Eighteenth Annual Status Report on Minorities in Higher Education 2002-01* that African-Americans continue to trail Whites in college participation in spite of gains made the past two decades (Harvey, 2001).

Access to education should be focused on those who have been traditionally underrepresented so as to make higher education more participatory in the traditions of

democracy (Dewey, 1966; Heller, 2001; Hurtado, 2001; Rushing, 2001). Furthermore, in democratic societies, adequate educational opportunities must be available to everyone (Messick, 1999; Rudenstine, 2001; Rushing, 2001). Therefore, for the benefit of the society as a whole, an increase of educational opportunities should be viewed as an incontrovertible public policy approach for the elimination of inequality and a challenge for higher education institutions.

Universities are seen as social institutions and in democratic societies their leaders have a responsibility to create a vision and implement a strategy to recruit traditionally underrepresented students (Berdahl, Altbach, & Gumport, 1999; Davies, Hides, & Casey, 2001). It is commonplace today that institutions show their commitments for access to education in their mission statements and planning documents (Mossberg, 2001; Rhodes, 2001; Rowley, Hurtado, & Ponjuan, 2002). The challenge for universities' leaders therefore, is to move beyond traditional admission policies and practices and institute effective programs to broaden access to higher education.

Universities have a special role in a democracy so as to create a literate society and opportunities for all (Alexander, 1993; Carnoy & Shearer, 1980; Dewey, 1966; Rhodes, 1998). In addition, they are seen as knowledge-producing organizations and should therefore have as their mission the provision of unrestricted access to everyone in the society they serve (Barnett, 1990; Newman, 1853/1976). With the special societal role that universities play, there is an increasing demand for access to higher education.

Today, most modern higher education institutions have a single overall administrative leader with varying degrees of expectations and responsibilities. The titles of the administrative head vary in the United States and the Republic of South Africa—

some known as a “president,” “chancellor,” “vice-chancellor,” or “rector.” While a title signifies some preference, most American higher education institutions have collectively used the title of “president” for their administrative head. In South Africa, the administrative head of a university is the vice-chancellor.

Even though a university may enjoy exceptional autonomy, the president still has the responsibility to respond to demands for access to higher education (Bargh, Bocock, Scott, & Smith, 2000). When a university is faced with managerial or political issues, the president implements decision-making initiatives to make sure people are treated fairly (Messick, 1999). Also, the president provides the leadership that deals with those issues society believes to be important (Davies, Hides, & Casey, 2001; Shapiro, 1998). Moreover, the president has the responsibility of providing sufficient leadership and commitment to the conditions necessary to generate maximum social dividends (Davies et al., 2001; Shapiro, 1998).<sup>1</sup>

In many countries, access to higher education is increasingly associated with social opportunity.<sup>2</sup> Today, more and more of those who have been underrepresented on college and university campuses desire and also demand an education. The recognition and perception that people are being treated fairly must be ensured even when constraints of scarce resources exist in the field of public policy (Brown, 2002; Rushing, 2001). More importantly, the implementation of a public policy is dependent on educational leaders to design and shape programs as a means of providing greater equality of

---

<sup>1</sup> This researcher serves as the Acting Director for Internal Auditing at the University of North Florida and reports to the President. On a regular basis, I see the President’s interaction as he exercises his leadership qualities to achieve maximum benefits for the University and community.

<sup>2</sup> As one who has traveled to over twenty countries, I have seen first-hand how education provides the bases for economic opportunities—especially in those countries where access to higher education is restricted to members of the ruling elites’ ethnic, or religious group.

opportunity for the disadvantaged and minorities (Downey, 1988; Dye, 2001; Jones, Yonezawa, Ballesteros, & Mehan, 2002; Keppel, 1991). Achieving this goal is a challenge for educational leaders who must understand the political intents and priorities and implement the policies within the boundaries of limited resources.

The issue of access to higher education is a challenge to policy makers and educators. From the standpoint of their leadership positions these individuals are now more cognizant of the economic and social impact on their community from the continued restriction of access to higher education for some minority students (Downey, 1988; Hurtado, 2001). With respect to this issue, the continued under-representation of minority students in higher education has attracted the interest of policy makers with the goal of increasing access. In the State of Washington, for example, the Governor reported on January 12, 2004, that he will ask state lawmakers to annul a ban on race-conscious public-college admissions policies adopted by that state's voters in 1998 (Schmidt, 2004). Similarly, in a dramatic move to increase access, Texas A&M University's president announced that he will eliminate admission preference for alumni relatives following state universities in Georgia and California (Golden, 2004).

In the State of Florida, the United States, and the Republic of South Africa, access to higher education has been and still is today a struggle for minorities. Indeed, the struggle for education has been primarily by those who are not part of the privileged group. Those not in the privileged group in the United States and South Africa (until the election of President Mandela in 1994) are generally everyone in the non-White population.

Political debates in both the State of Florida and the Republic of South Africa on issues of access have been bitter. While political sentiments influence access policies, the public policy goals of the United States and South Africa were, nevertheless, to do away with past discrimination and to improve the learning environment for everyone (Brown, 2002; Koorts, 2000; McLaughlin, 2000). In the State of Florida and the Republic of South Africa political decisions aimed at issues of access to higher education became a reality.

The Governor of the State of Florida, Jeb Bush, on November 9, 1999, issued Executive Order 99-281 (see Appendix A) establishing the One Florida Initiative (hereinafter referred to as “OFI”) that essentially barred the use of race as a factor in university admissions (Bush, 2000a). Governor Bush exclaimed his OFI would increase the enrollment of traditionally underrepresented groups in higher education and make the system fairer for everyone (Bush, 2000a). Public universities in the State of Florida are now required to implement OFI.

Likewise, the South African government in February 2001 issued its National Plan for Higher Education—see Appendix B—(hereinafter referred to as “SANPHE”) (National Plan, 2001). SANPHE essentially seeks to redress past discriminatory practices in South Africa and provide increased access to higher education (National Plan, 2001). South African universities are now faced with the monumental task of implementing their country’s SANPHE to replace discriminatory laws that were passed with impunity against the non-White population.

However limited, higher education institutions are now adopting strategies to increase access for those who have been traditionally underrepresented in the State of

Florida and South Africa. While both OFI and SANPHE are policies that respectively establish an authoritative framework for access, it is within responsive higher education institutions that conditions for access will be developed (Downey, 1988; Wagner, 1989). Educational institutions' leaders in Florida and South Africa are now faced with implementing these new policies.

### *History of Higher Education in the United States*

The purpose of this section is to discuss the history of access to higher education in the United States in the context in which it has been denied to those who are not a member of the dominant group in the population.

At the founding of Harvard University in 1636, the first statutes governing admissions were intended to benefit the elite, dominant, Anglo-Saxon population (Anderson, 2002; Sadler & Hammerman, 1999). The dominant group fervently believed it was a superior race as a result of divine guidance. Because of the fundamental belief in their superior intelligence, they rationalized and justified their subordination of Native Americans and Africans slaves and excluded them from most forms of educational institutions (Adams, 1995; Anderson, 2002; Berkhofer, 1978; Smedley, 1993; Takaki, 1993). The dominant White Anglo-Saxon group systematically institutionalized its control over the non-White population through effective laws based on its superior intelligence (Berkhofer, 1978; Smedley, 1993; Takaki, 1993). With this control, the non-White population was essentially barred from all higher education institutions.

The belief of superiority pervaded in American society for several hundred years. The common belief that the Anglo-Saxon race was superior and that the non-White population was an inferior race institutionalized the exclusion of the non-White

population from higher education. The higher education system was in effect an elite system and it was not until 1835 that African Americans were first admitted to higher education institutions (Anderson, 2002). The perpetuation of racial issues in the US education system persisted and posed many challenges for educators and policy makers.

While the United States Constitution does not mention who has the responsibility for education, it still nevertheless gave Congress the power to raise money for worthwhile causes. In terms of education, the Tenth Amendment (U.S. Constitution) gave the States those powers that are not delegated in the Constitution. In effect, the Tenth Amendment is seen as the legal authority for states to establish responsibility for and control of education. This legal authority, subject to certain limitations imposed by the United States Constitution, allows the states to design and shape their educational systems.

The United States government through legislation such as the Morrill Act of 1862 donated large tracts of land to states to build “land-grant” universities and to create opportunities for their respective populations (Anderson, 2002). However, as access to higher education for the non-White population began to increase, the quality was nevertheless inferior to what the White population experienced (Anderson, 2002; Sadler & Hammerman, 1999).

The concerns and issues of access in the higher education arena have been growing as most Americans (including the non-White population) see the value of education as a gateway to an improved life style.<sup>3</sup> The struggle for access to higher education has been a battle (legally and through social movements such as massive demonstrations) for the non-White populations (Anderson, 2002; King, 1964; Sadler &

---

<sup>3</sup> As an American with an Asian background, my parents have continually since early childhood stressed the importance for a higher education degree as it values a lifelong quality of life.



Hammerman, 1999). Discriminatory policies were challenged in the courts and demonstrations demanding access were common in the Southern States where access was more repressed (Anderson, 2002; Rushing, 2001).

As the civil rights movement of the 1960's gained the thrust it sought in the public arena, access to higher education was seen as a solution to the root cause of the endemic poverty of the non-White population—especially African Americans (King, 1964; Rushing, 2001). Affirmative action evolved out of Executive Orders 10925 and 11246 issued by President Kennedy and President Johnson respectively to rectify some of the injustices suffered by minorities (Anderson, 2002; Sadler & Hammerman, 1999; Schwartz, 1988; Thornberry, 1983).

Executive Order 10925 issued by President Kennedy in 1961 introduced the idea that an “affirmative action” policy would help those who have been discriminated against. Later, significant legislation such as the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act became law in 1964 and 1965, respectively. These two acts were important legal tools to initiate the ending of discrimination in the United States through affirmative action. Essentially, an affirmative action program was designed to end centuries of discrimination by specific procedures directed to provide opportunities so that minorities could move into the mainstream of society (Anderson, 2002; Sadler & Hammerman, 1999; Schwartz, 1988; Thornberry, 1983).

In terms of education, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination based on race, color or national origin in any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance (Title VI of the Civil Rights Act). Subsequently, the United States Commission on Civil Rights in 1977 defined affirmative action as “any measure,

beyond simple termination of discrimination practice, adopted to correct and compensate for past or present discrimination or to prevent discrimination from recurring in the future” (United States Commission on Civil Rights, 1977, p. 2).

The aim of access to higher education is intertwined with affirmative action and diversity. Affirmative action programs became an innovative approach to end discrimination and, in essence, the non-White populations viewed these programs as positive actions to help end discrimination (Hassim, 2000; King, 1964; Schwartz, 1988; Wilson, 2001). The increased awareness of affirmative action programs within higher education helped many minorities gain access to higher education (Anderson, 2002; Sadler & Hammerman, 1999; Schwartz, 1988; Thornberry, 1983). While these programs were designed to help minorities, they also caused much concern and became an explosive issue (Hassim, 2000; Orfield, 1998; Schwartz, 1988; Thomas, 2001; Wilson, 2001).

In the higher education contextual framework, affirmative action simply means an institution will aggressively encourage and assist minorities or women to apply for a place in a program (Ibarra, 2001; McWhirter, 1996). Trent (1991) voiced the specificity of affirmative action when he pointed out that it is the strategies that are directed at the non-White pool of applicants by universities to enroll them in their programs. Also, Lindsay and Justiz (2001) exclaimed that affirmative action is the policy and programmatic mechanisms offering educational opportunities to those not able to fully participate in American higher education. Moreover, Tierney and Chung (2001) pointed out that in higher education, affirmative action is an approach to redress past discriminatory practices and to uphold the benefits of diversity. In sum, all the

perspectives show that for the most part, affirmative action is the basis to give more access, more equity and more equitable representation to those who have been traditionally underrepresented.

Competition for a higher education intensified as some institutions increased admission opportunities through access programs for minorities. As the society of the United States becomes more diverse, the demand for higher education becomes an important public policy issue (Hurtado, 2001; Jones, Yonezawa, Ballesteros, & Mehan, 2002). Equally important, as the demand for a higher education became more intense, so have the opposition and resistance to affirmative action programs designed to increase access (Anderson, 2002; King, 2001a; Messick, 1999). Consequently, court challenges to higher education policies that provide access to traditionally underrepresented students are coming under more intense scrutiny in an effort to make the system a fair one for all (Anderson, 2002; Orfield, 1998; Sadler & Hammerman, 1999; Schwartz, 1988; Thornberry, 1983).

To achieve access in higher education, the early affirmative action focus was on Black students. Today, the focus is on Blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, and women in higher education (Thomas, 2001; Trent, 1991; Wilson, 2001). It was believed that affirmative action would be a way to compensate for losses experienced by individuals who have been traditionally discriminated against (Thomas, 2001). Proponents of affirmative action believed this approach to compensate for losses would level the playing field (Ibarra, 2001; Wilson, 2001).

In terms of redressing past discrimination, Dr. Martin Luther King (1964) voiced his rationale in *Why We Can't Wait*:

Whenever this issue of compensatory or preferential treatment for the Negro is raised, some of our friends recoil in horror. The Negro should be granted equality, they agree; but he should ask for nothing more. On the surface, this appears reasonable, but it is not realistic. For it is obvious that if a man is entering at the starting line in a race three hundred years after another man, the first man would have to perform some impossible feat in order to catch up with his fellow runner. (p. 134)

It may be said that the assault on affirmative action is an assault on access to higher education. For those who have been traditionally excluded from higher education, and who have benefited from affirmative action, the assault on it is an issue of much concern (Anderson, 2002; Orfield, 1998; Sadler & Hammerman, 1999; Schwartz, 1988; Thornberry, 1983). Abolishing, modifying or even changing any aspects of affirmative action not only limits access to higher education but also conveys an indication to minority groups and their advocates, access to higher education will indeed be restricted and reduced (Anderson, 2002; Orfield, 1998; Sadler & Hammerman, 1999; Schwartz, 1988; Thornberry, 1983). Further, many minorities look closely for signs to modify or even change any aspect of access to higher education and when they do, they generally decide that they will not be able to enter a higher education institution (Anderson, 2002; Orfield, 1998; Sadler & Hammerman, 1999; Schwartz, 1988; Thornberry, 1983). Yet, others see restricting access to higher education as closing the door to the American dream and a considerable threat to their personal and community's future (Anderson, 2002; Orfield, 1998; Sadler & Hammerman, 1999; Schwartz, 1988; Thornberry, 1983).

Issues of access to higher education have been brought to the federal courts. The courts have raised challenging arguments relating to the value of affirmative action and diversity and the impact on access to higher education for those who have been traditionally underrepresented in colleges and universities (Brown, 2002; Hurtado, 2001;

Jones, Yonezawa, Ballesteros, & Mehan, 2002; Orfield, 2001; Orfield & Whitley, 2001; Rudenstine, 2001; Rushing, 2001; Tierney & Chung, 2002). Routinely, the courts' decisions have been controversial and have had a growing impact on higher education admission programs designed to increase the number of some groups of students who traditionally were not accepted.

On the whole, the legal challenges have significant implications for access to higher education. Reforms to access programs that benefit traditionally underrepresented students are by themselves political in origin but necessary to remove profoundly embedded discrimination (Orfield, 2001; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). For educational leaders, the challenges show the importance of discretion in implementation of public policy and the type of reforms these leaders implement in their respective institutions (Anderson, 2002; Gaston, 2001; Hurtado, 2001; Milem, 2001; Palmer, 2001). In relation to educational access, the reforms were also important in that institutions were able to design programs to increase access for those who have been historically discriminated against. Some of the challenges and relevant substantive details about legal challenges are discussed below.

### *Legal Challenges*

The purpose of this section is to discuss significant court cases and their decisions with respect to the issue of access and how they impacted those people who have been generally excluded from higher education institutions.

Two of the earlier court challenges that impacted the educational arena were *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) and *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954). *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) did not involve schools but rather was a Louisiana statute that required segregated

railway accommodations. In this case, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the concept of “separate but equal” accommodations was a legal one. This “separate but equal” concept was later applied to justify segregated educational institutions and permitted states to deny African American students access to all-White universities. This practice of “separate but equal” was justification for continuing to restrict access to education for African Americans.

However, in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), the United States Supreme Court overturned the *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) decision and ruled that racially segregated schools were inherently unequal and unconstitutional. *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) was perhaps the most important Supreme Court ruling that highlighted the issue of access to quality education for all Americans. The Court then ruled that states had to eliminate segregated schools. *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) brought an end to the “separate but equal” doctrine and endorsed the concept of equality.

Since *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), other challenges of access to higher education institutions have reached the United States Supreme Court. These challenges have focused on issues of access, namely, affirmative action, admissions criteria, diversity, and a race-conscious admissions policy (Altbach, Lomotey, & Rivers, 2002). The first legal challenge that reached the United States Supreme Court was the *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* (1978).

In the *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* (1978) case, Mr. Allan Bakke, a White medical school applicant, challenged the school’s policy on the grounds that it constituted race discrimination under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Ball, 2000; Schwartz, 1988). He contended that the setting aside of a fixed number of positions for

minority applicants was unconstitutional. The United States Supreme Court ruled that the setting aside of places exclusively for a group was not permissible but the use of race as a factor was permissible. The Supreme Court also ruled that racial consideration of the applicant could be an admissions factor in the interest of diversifying the university environment. The *Bakke* case and the Supreme Court's decision were subsequently used as the primary justification for affirmative action programs and increasing access to higher education for minorities (Ball, 2000; Schwartz, 1988).

Since the *Bakke* decision, there have been a number of other court cases that challenged admission policies and procedures. Some of the courts' decisions narrowed the race-conscious admission policies to increase access to higher education and the courts also challenged standards aimed at maintaining integration (Orfield & Whitley, 2001). The primary justification for a race-conscious policy has been that it enriches the educational experience, broadens the intellectual life in the university, and helps to correct past injustice (Anderson, 2002; Orfield & Whitley, 2001; Sadler & Hammerman, 1999; Schwartz, 1988; Thornberry, 1983).

The courts' fundamental legal argument for defending race-conscious policies was that the policies are a response to a "compelling interest" of the institution that cannot be achieved by another method and that it is "narrowly tailored" to achieve that interest (Orfield & Whitley, 2001). While the Supreme Court ruled that a university's goal in maintaining a diversity program was a compelling one for provision of an affirmative action program for access to higher education, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit nevertheless rejected the diversity rationale (Orfield & Whitley, 2001).

In *Hopwood v. Texas* (1996), the 5<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the University of Texas School of Law's race conscious admissions policy to promote diversity was unconstitutional. Furthermore, the Court challenged the idea and validity that racial diversity promotes educational diversity (Chapa & Lazaro, 1998; Schmidt & Selingo, 2002). As a result of this decision, the University of Texas system changed its admissions procedures to comply with the court's ruling. The case was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court two times but it declined both times to hear the case because the University of Texas had changed its admissions practices (Schmidt & Selingo, 2002).

In another legal challenge of access to higher education, the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit issued its ruling on May 14, 2002, concerning the University of Michigan's Law School admissions policy (*Grutter v. Bollinger*, 2002; Schmidt & Selingo, 2002). The court ruled that the University's use of a race-conscious admissions policy to diversify its student body was legal. However, the dissenting justices stated this case was a straightforward instance of racial discrimination by a state institution (*Grutter v. Bollinger*, 2002; Schmidt & Selingo, 2002).

Jeffrey S. Lehman, Dean of the University of Michigan Law School, in a commentary about the Court's decision pointed out that it leaves in place a policy that is as cautious a form of affirmative action as one may find in higher education (Lehman, 2002). Moreover, the Dean noted that the decision was consistent with guidelines of the United States Supreme Court decision in *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* (1978). The Sixth Circuit Appeals Court's decision has shown the importance of university leaders' discretion in the development and implementation of policies that pertain to providing access to higher education.



Another lawsuit (*Gratz v. Bollinger*) was filed in 1997 on behalf of two White students against the University of Michigan (Schmidt & Selingo, 2002). The students were rejected from the university's College of Literature, Science, and the Arts. A federal judge upheld the university's admissions policies and the students appealed to the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals—however, the court has not ruled on the case (Schmidt & Selingo, 2002). The lawyers for the students have urged the Supreme Court to hear arguments for their case without waiting for the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court to rule. The Supreme Court on December 2, 2002, announced it would hear both cases (*Gratz v. Bollinger* and *Grutter v. Bollinger*) (Schmidt, 2002b; Schmidt & Selingo, 2002; Selingo, 2002).

The U.S. Supreme Court's announcement in December 2002 to hear both cases had an immediate and tremendous response from many individuals and organizations from both the private and public sectors (O'Neil, 2002; Schmidt, 2002a; Selingo, 2002). President George W. Bush (Bush, 2003) announced on February 13, 2003, that while he supports diversity of all kinds—including racial diversity in higher education—he believed that “the method the University of Michigan uses to achieve this important goal is fundamentally flawed” (p. 1). He also announced his administration will intend to file an *amicus curiae* or “friend of the court” brief with the Supreme Court arguing that the University of Michigan's admissions process is unconstitutional (Bush, 2003). In addition, he noted some states are now using innovative ways to diversify their student bodies such as guaranteeing admissions to a percentage of top students in high schools (Bush, 2003; Horn & Flores, 2003; Marin & Lee, 2003).

The importance of these two cases to various individuals and organizations from different ideological beliefs was evident from the drive to file briefs with the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court received more than 60 *amicus curiae*—friendly briefs—supporting the use of race-conscious admissions by the University of Michigan (Schmidt, 2003a). Those who have supported a brief include 29 former top-ranking officers and civilian leaders of the military—including Admiral William J. Crowe and Generals Wesley K. Clark, H. Norman Schwarzkopf, and John M. D. Shalikashvili.<sup>4</sup> Others supporting the University of Michigan include the governors from Michigan and New Jersey, attorneys general from 22 states and leaders from 300 organizations (from colleges and universities), education associations (including the American Council on Education), civil-rights organizations, student groups, businesses (including sixty-four Fortune 500 companies), labor unions and professional organizations) (Schmidt, 2002b). The U.S. Supreme Court was not obligated legally to read the briefs and most of the briefs were likely to be given little weight on the cases (Schmidt, 2003b).

On June 23, 2003, the Supreme Court issued its ruling on both cases (*Gratz v. Bollinger* and *Grutter v. Bollinger*). In *Gratz v. Bollinger*, the Court ruled that the University of Michigan's undergraduate admission policy of allowing extra points for minority students treated whole groups of applicants differently and that the policy violated the Constitution's Equal Protection Clause and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Schmidt, 2003c). Furthermore, in *Grutter v. Bollinger*, the Court ruled in favor of the University of Michigan using some form of affirmative action to maintain a

---

<sup>4</sup> As a current officer in the United States Air Force Reserves, this researcher does support the view by these high-ranking officers in their assertion in their *amicus curiae* that "a highly qualified, racially diverse officer corps is essential to the military's ability to fulfill its principle mission to provide national security."

racially and ethnically diverse student body (Schmidt, 2003c).

The Court's decision endorsed the value of affirmative action, diversity and the need to promote access to higher education for those who have been traditionally discriminated against (Greenhouse, 2003). The decision also endorsed the role of higher education to create a more equal society and that university administrators could use race-conscious admissions criteria to achieve a diversified student body (Greenhouse, 2003).

Other legal challenges—political—to university admissions policies have also been initiated outside of institutions of higher education. For example, in 1996, the citizens of the State of California introduced a referendum, Proposition 209, the California Civil Rights Initiative, to the electorate. The Initiative passed and it essentially prohibited the use of racial or gender preferences in universities' admissions criteria (Wilson, 2001). The result of this decision was momentous for California—the impact on access to higher education was significant. Wilson (2001) reported that the number of minority students who enrolled at the University of California dropped significantly as a result of this initiative.

The passage of Proposition 209 in California led to similar action in the State of Florida in 1999. However, the attempt to introduce a similar version of Proposition 209 to Florida's ballot to abolish affirmative action policies did not succeed. The Florida Civil Rights Initiative (hereinafter referred to as "FCRI") was Florida's response to Proposition 209. FCRI essentially sought to end affirmative action programs that benefit minorities. The Florida Supreme Court ruled on July 13, 2000, that FCRI violated the single subject statutory rule applicable to citizens' ballot initiatives and it could not be

placed on the Florida ballot (Carcieri, 2001). Nevertheless, the Initiative's sponsors have stated they plan to reintroduce it at a later time. Meanwhile, Florida's Governor, Jeb Bush, introduced the OFI as a political compromise to the FCRI in November 1999 (Bush, 2000a).

### *One Florida Initiative*

The purpose of this section is to discuss the genesis of the One Florida Initiative and the salient points in relation to access to higher education for those who have been discriminated against.

On November 9, 1999, Governor Jeb Bush issued Executive Order 99-281 establishing the OFI. This Order addressed reforms in the state universities and in state contracting procedures that "pit one racial group against another" (Bush, 2000a, p. 1). Also, it essentially barred the use of race as a factor in university admissions (Bush, 2000a). At the onset, the OFI was perceived as an assault on previous gains made to access higher education during the civil rights struggle. Moreover, in a study published in August 2000 by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education on Florida, it was reported "Floridians see access to higher education as equivalent to access to the American dream" (Immerwahr, 2000, p. 1).

Governor Bush in his announcement of the OFI stated his intent was to create a world-class educational system (Bush, 2000a). He also said his intention was to advance the cause of diversity in new and more effective ways and he "cannot compromise his basic principles." He stated that he understood "those who fear the loss of hard-fought gains won by champions in the unrelenting struggle for civil rights" (Bush, 2000b, p. 1). Governor Bush's focus on education has been contentious from the start and the

educational component of OFI has been perceived as removing all gains to access to higher education by those who have been traditionally underrepresented in the state university system (Horn & Flores, 2003; Selingo, 1999).

In terms of access to higher education, the education component of OFI will have a great impact on those who have traditionally been underrepresented in the state's universities. Specifically, OFI calls for:

- The elimination of race and ethnicity as a factor in university admissions (Bush, 2000a).
- The implementation of the Talented 20 Program. This Program will guarantee state university admission to the top 20 percent of high school students who graduate, regardless of one's SAT or ACT scores (Bush, 2000a).

The elimination of race and ethnicity as a factor in university admissions is a challenge that education leaders will face as they implement One Florida. Their challenges to access are enmeshed with issues of affirmative action, diversity and social promotion.

For educational leaders in Florida's higher education institutions, OFI brought new challenges. It will now require the leaders to design programs and initiatives to ensure access to higher education for minorities. The focus of this study will be to understand how higher education leaders implement programs and initiatives to provide educational access to minorities.

Education leaders will have to develop a vision and deploy a strategy within their respective institutions to implement OFI (Davies, Hides, & Casey, 2001). For education

leaders in Florida, the issue of access to higher education will require discretion in their implementation and actions to implement OFI.

### *History of Higher Education in the Republic of South Africa*

The purpose of this section is to discuss the history of access to higher education in South Africa in the context in which it has been denied to those who are not a member of the dominant group in the population.

In 1652, the Dutch East India Company established a support base in Cape Town, South Africa. Soon, other European settlers arrived and the indigenous people lost control of traditional lands and property. As the Europeans achieved political and economic dominance, inequalities for non-White South Africans became a reality. By 1910, the Union of South Africa was established and non-White hopes for political participation were dashed (Worden, 2000). After 1910, Whites controlled all systems of power in South Africa. For other significant events in South Africa's history, refer to Appendix C.

In 1948, the National Party of South Africa came to power. The National Party had the support of the overwhelming majority of the Afrikaan-speaking White people. The Afrikaner people, an "amalgam of nationalities," speak Afrikaans, a derivative of Dutch brought to South Africa from the original settlers who arrived in 1652 (Davenport & Saunders, 2000, p. 22). Immediately after winning the elections in 1948, the government consolidated its power and very methodically abolished black participation in the political system (Davenport & Saunders, 2000).

The National Party through its consolidation eliminated every evidence of racial equality in the political system and the government began to practice its program of

apartheid. To understand modern South Africa, one must understand the meaning of and impact of apartheid on the people of South Africa. Van Niekerk, Van der Waldt, and Jonker explained:

Apartheid is a value system, a form of government, an ideology, and a policy of racial segregation that formally came into being in South Africa in 1948 under the National Party government. The basic principle of apartheid is that “race,” or the classification of a person as belonging to a particular race grouping, determines the role and function of that person within the state. Apartheid has a clear ideological component as it is reflected in the philosophy and practical application thereof. Legislation ensured segregation of blacks, colored, Indians, and Whites with regard to public transport, residential areas, churches, educational institutions, public facilities, and political representation. (Van Niekerk, Van der Waldt, & Jonker, 2001, p. 34)

This policy of apartheid established White supremacy in South Africa and it became the basis for the subjugation of all non-White South Africans.

Under apartheid, the South African education system was segregated along ethnic, racial and geographical lines. Particularly there have been deep cleavages and inequalities between Afrikaner, English and Black universities (Welsh & Savage, 1978). Black universities came into existence as a result of various governmental actions (Kgware, 1978). The governmental actions served to restrict the autonomy and academic freedom of black universities. Also, for Black South Africans, the struggle to gain access to higher education has been restricted by the barriers that have received an official and tacit governmental approval (Kgware, 1978; Kruss, 2001). For Black South Africans, access to their higher education system is a decisive approach needed to redress past inequalities and erase apartheid completely from their society (Kruss, 2001; Roussouw, 2001).

As South African higher education leaders moved to lead their institutions away from apartheid, they faced overwhelming challenges. Apartheid has left South Africa in a very bleak state where the majority of black children “are still being in inferior schools with little infrastructure, few books, and poorly qualified and unprofessional teachers” (Woods 1999, p. 127). As Black students enter colleges and universities, educational leaders are faced with addressing the inadequate background of these students.

Rhodes University (considered one of South Africa’s elite universities), for example, conducts a comprehensive assessment of disadvantaged students to obtain a cognitive evaluation of how to best serve the student (Woods, 1999). Also, the University of Cape Town has tried to attract more black students. However, “the eligible pool of students has not grown over the past five years, because of persistent problems in South African high-school education” (Rossouw, 2001, p. A40).

South African education leaders will play a crucial role in implementing the National Plan for Higher Education. Their strategies and practices to implement the National Plan to assist those students who have been historically discriminated against will be important for South Africa to redress past inequalities. How these strategies and practices are designed and put into operation is important to understand.

Discrimination was in effect legal against all non-White South Africans. The outcry and revolt by non-White South Africans demanding basic rights was heard throughout the world (Kruss, 2001; Roussouw, 2001). The popular African National Congress (ANC) and other anti-apartheid movements challenged the government to change its discriminatory policies and engage in discussions to democratize South Africa. In April 1994, the ANC won the national elections, and its leader, Nelson Rolihlahla



Mandela, was elected the first president in the first free election in the history of South Africa.

The euphoria over the results of the first free election brought swift change to remove all vestiges of apartheid. The government acted immediately to protect those who have been marginalized and to press for changes that would protect the fundamental rights of its citizens (Beck, 2000; Davenport & Saunders, 2000; Thompson, 2001). The new government formed commissions, committees and working groups to develop plans of action in many areas of government. The Ministry of Education created its own commissions, committees and working groups to investigate redress of past educational inequities. Public hearings were conducted to determine how affordable, non-discriminatory and quality education would be available to all South Africans.

Post-apartheid access to South Africa's higher education system is grounded philosophically in law. For many in South Africa, access to higher education has been a struggle for those who saw themselves as oppressed groups pitted against the dominant and privileged groups. Because South Africans regard education as a basic human right, a review of the genesis of human rights will show the interrelationship of this construct with access to higher education (Beck, 2000; Kruss, 2001; National Plan, 2001; Rushing, 2001). Non-White South Africans view their denial of basic human rights in the apartheid era as an abomination of what they endured for several hundreds of years. Clearly, the international community has come to accept basic human rights as a condition for human existence. See Appendix D for a list of major declarations and conventions that enunciated the right to an education.

Since the arrival of the first White settlers in 1652, all human rights declarations and covenants have denied human rights to all non-Whites through official government actions. Human rights were not a concept that was applicable to non-Whites; however, since the election of President Mandela in 1994, it has been a very important one to all non-White South Africans. Non-White South Africans see the concept of human rights as their basic guarantee to dignity and the access to all economic benefits including higher education that all White South Africans have enjoyed for centuries.

South Africa's National Plan for Higher Education is a comprehensive and compelling document to redress past inequalities and to provide greater access to higher education (Beck, 2000; Kruss, 2001; National Plan, 2001; Rushing, 2001). The Ministry of Education, in an effort to redress past inequalities and deficiencies of the apartheid era, was guided by the universal principle of a human right to basic education (Lomofsky & Lazarus, 2001). Separate and deficient education systems for non-White South Africans and the discriminatory practices of all educational institutions could no longer be tolerated nor were compatible with the ideals of a truly democratic society (Alexander, 1993; Conant, 1965; Dewey, 1966; Lomofsky & Lazarus, 2001; Niebuhr, 1960; Vergnani, 2001). The crafting of the National Plan for Higher Education was indeed a major shift from the previous discriminatory practices of the philosophy of apartheid.

The concept of universal human rights was a guiding principle in crafting South Africa's National Plan for Higher Education. In the pursuit of establishing greater access to higher education, and in the interest of the public good, the government's reliance on human rights was deemed consistent with democratic values (Alexander, 1993; Conant, 1965; Dewey, 1966; Enslin & Pendlebury, 2000; Lomofsky & Lazarus, 2001; Niebuhr,

1960; Unterhalter, 2000). While the National Plan is now law, the real challenge lies in implementation. Educational leaders now have a difficult challenge in implementing the Plan and providing equal access to higher education.

In acknowledging the inequalities of the apartheid era, the Government of South Africa now has a fundamental policy document to guide it in redressing past discriminatory practices. Educational leaders must now be willing to develop programs and adopt the approach of “differential access but equal exit” for all South African students (Woods, 1999, p. 130). The challenges for South African educational leaders will be immense to ensure all South Africans have an opportunity to attend and succeed in higher education.

#### *South African National Education Plan*

The purpose of this section is to discuss the genesis of the South African National Education Plan and the salient points in relation to access to higher education for those who have been discriminated against.

Nelson Mandela’s decisive electoral victory in South Africa’s first democratic election in April 1994 brought an end to apartheid. Mandela spoke often of *ubuntu*, an African concept of human brotherhood, mutual responsibility and compassion and which influenced much of the new government’s policies (Beck, 2000; Mandela, 1994; Thompson, 2001). Soon after his government was sworn in, numerous commissions and committees were established to safeguard human rights and redress past injustice in every aspect of South African society. To ensure that all in the South African society were afforded equal opportunity while at the same time attempting to correct past injustices and inequality, the newly established Constitutional Court and the Truth and

Reconciliation Commission were established (Grundy, 2000; Gutto, 1998; Worden, 2000). The Constitutional Court was established to ensure equality for all under the law and to ensure that the new South Africa (post-apartheid) was based on the rule of law and respect for human rights (Beck, 2000; Gutto, 1998).

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) headed by Nobel Laureate Bishop Desmond Tutu was established to hold hearings on allegations of human rights abuses committed under the apartheid government between March 1, 1960, and December 6, 1993 (Graybill, 1998; Thompson, 2001; Tutu, 1999). The TRC began its hearings on December 1995 and held over fifty public hearings (Thompson, 2001). By the time the report went to press in 1998, more than seven thousand individuals applied for amnesty (Thompson, 2001; Tutu, 1999).

The stories of human rights abuses were shocking and the brutality of the police and military forces came out in the open. For most South Africans, this was a very difficult time as they tried to understand how the injustices happened. Nevertheless, the healing process had begun for the country. In an attempt to overhaul its education system, the government passed the Schools Act in 1997. This Act abolished the apartheid directed segregated education and established one Department of National Education for all South Africans (Davenport & Saunders, 2000; Pedro, 1997). In addition, this legislation showed the government's resolve to remove segregated policies and launch a drive toward educational equality. For all South Africans who have been historically discriminated against, educational equality was a dream (Beck, 2000; Kruss, 2001; National Plan, 2001; Rushing, 2001).

The Ministry of Education was determined to change the South African education system. In search of innovative ways, it created committees with members who reflected on the South African society. In February 2001, the Ministry of Education issued the National Plan for Higher Education. Minister of Education, Professor Kader Asmal, noted, “the National Plan recognizes the current strengths and weaknesses of the higher education system and is based on a developmental approach that is intended to guide institutions towards meeting the goals for the system as a whole” (National Plan, 2001, p. 1).

The National Plan for Higher Education is based on the policy framework that seeks “to redress past inequalities and to transform the higher education system to serve a new social order, to meet pressing national needs, to respond to new realities and opportunities” (National Plan, 2001, p. 1).

In February 2001, the government issued its National Plan for Higher Education (hereinafter referred to as, “National Plan”). The National Plan acknowledged the government’s task to “overhaul the social, political, economic and cultural institutions of South Africa to bring them in line with the imperatives of a new democratic order” (National Plan, 2001, p. 1). In acknowledging that “higher education, and public higher education especially, has immense potential to contribute to the consolidation of democracy and social justice and the growth and development of the economy,” the National Plan called for:

- Providing increased access to higher education to all irrespective of race, gender, age, creed, class or disability and to produce graduates with the skills and competencies necessary to meet the

human resource needs of the country.

- Promoting equity of access and to redress past inequalities through ensuring that the staff and student profiles in higher education progressively reflect the democratic realities of South African society.
- Ensuring diversity in the organizational form and institutional landscape of the higher education system through mission and programme differentiation, thus enabling the addressing of regional and national needs in social and economic development. (National Plan, 2001, p. 14)

With this policy framework, the National Plan, if implemented effectively, would advance the unity of the new South Africa through the democratization of its education system by redressing past inequalities. For educational leaders, the challenges to redress past inequalities will demand strategies that are imaginative to end the discriminatory practices common in the South African higher education system (Beck, 2000; Kruss, 2001; National Plan, 2001; Rushing, 2001).

#### *Statement of Purpose*

The general purpose of this study is to (1) examine the issues educational leaders face in implementing the One Florida Initiative (OFI) and the South African National Plan for Higher Education (SANPHE), and (2) describe the impact these policies have had on selected higher education institutions within both nations.

#### *Research Questions*

The research questions of this study are:

1. What were the assumptions and political processes that contributed

to the establishment of OFI and SANPHE policies?

2. How did the leadership at selected institutions implement OFI and SANPHE policies?

### *Definitions of Terms*

Several terms used in this proposal require explanation and further definition.

They are as follows:

Access to higher education refers “to increasing enrollments for low income or minority students in colleges, institutes and universities beyond secondary education” (Wetzel, O’Toole, & Peterson, 1998, p. 47).

Affirmative action is described as “any measure, beyond simple termination of discriminatory practice, adopted to correct and compensate for past or present discrimination or to prevent discrimination from recurring in the future” (United States Commission on Civil Rights, 1977, p. 2).

Black in South Africa refers to “anyone who is not White, covering racial groups sometimes referred to as Coloured, Indian and African” (Makoni, Moody, Sr., & Mabokela, 2001, p. 45).

Black students in the United States are students who self-report their race as Negro, Black or African American.

College students are males and females who are currently enrolled at a higher education institution such as a college, institute or university beyond secondary education (high school) (Wetzel, O’Toole, & Peterson, 1998).

Ethnic means “pertaining to race; peculiar to a race or nation. Also, pertaining to or having common racial, religious, or linguistic characteristics, especially designating a racial or other group within a larger system” (Oxford Electronic Dictionary, 2003).

Leadership is:

- Influencing change in the conduct of people (Nash, 1929).
- Engaging and mobilizing the human needs and aspirations of followers (Burns, 1978).
- A form of power that symbolizes one’s capacity to explain one’s intention into reality and sustain it (Bennis, 1999).
- Ability to influence a group of individuals towards achievement of a particular goal (Drucker, 1999).

Minority means “a small group of people differing from the rest of the community in ethnic origin, religion, language, etc.; (now sometimes more generally) any identifiable subgroup within a society, *esp.* one perceived as suffering from discrimination or from relative lack of status or power” (Oxford Electronic Dictionary, 2003).

Political processes means the decision-making proceedings and actions taken by elected officials to implement the One Florida Initiative and the South African National Plan for Higher Education.

Tertiary education means either college, institute or university education beyond secondary education (high school) (Wetzel, O’Toole, & Peterson, 1998).

### *Significance of Study*

This study will contribute to a body of knowledge related to policy analysis, educational leadership and policy implementation. Policymaking is a purely political



process—a process through which competing demands reach a consensus or resolution of a problem or conflict situation (Downey, 1988; Dye, 2001; Wildavsky, 1979). The implementation of the policy will require discretionary actions by those within positions of authority (in this study, educational leaders); this study will build the knowledge base on how these individuals implement the policy.

As a comparative policy analysis, this study will also add to the higher education knowledge base on how students gain or are denied access to tertiary education. Currently, access to education is a political and social issue with which all national governments must contend. This study will extend the understanding and challenges educators in the United States and South Africa face. Also, it is hoped that this study will bring new perspectives to better understand both educational systems. As a cross-national analysis, it will attempt to uncover key assumptions, analyze approaches needed to help students access to higher education, and reframe issues that do not appear when studied alone (Eckel, 2001).

Finally, the value of comparative analysis can be viewed from a perspective posited by Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court:

In my view, comparative analysis emphatically is relevant to the task of interpreting constitutions and enforcing human rights. We are losers if we neglect what others can tell us about endeavors to eradicate bias against women, minorities, and other disadvantaged groups. For irrational prejudice and rank discrimination are infectious in our world. In this reality, as well as the determination to counter it, we all share (Ginsburg, 2000, p. 3).

### *Value of Research*

The value of this research will be first to add to the research on implementing education policy. Second, it will provide insight on the challenges senior university

administrators confront in implementing a mandated/legislated policy. Thirdly, it will add to the research on the role of leadership in institutional change.

### *Conclusion*

Access to higher education is an important public policy issue. The demand for access to higher education is increasing, as a society becomes more diverse and national economies become more complex and linked with other countries. Consequently, the role of the university is even more important today as people see access to higher education as a pathway for economic success.

University leaders are faced with implementing policies that affect access. The One Florida Initiative and the South African National Plan for Higher Education are two policies that are enmeshed with issues of diversity, affirmative action, leadership and policy making. These are important challenges for senior university leaders, as they must develop strategies to implement their respective policy.

The following chapter summarizes the substantive research that guided this study and that provided a theoretical framework for the analysis of the data and reporting of emergent themes.

## CHAPTER TWO

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a conceptual framework and bridge between the broad assortment of articles, books, studies and reports on the topic of access to higher education. This review linked together the relevant literature to show not only the historical account of access to higher education but revealed equally valid issues that need to be resolved.

As yet, there has been no in-depth examination, and more specifically, no comparative analysis studies published on the One Florida Initiative (OFI) and the South African National Plan for Higher Education (SANPHE). Various searches made using ERIC, Education Abstracts, and Dissertation Abstracts resulted in no comparative studies. However, studies referencing both of the policies separately have been found and will be cited appropriately below.

The published literature was explored using ERIC, Education Abstracts, Dissertation Abstracts and online services from major publishing houses for refereed scholarly journals. In addition, the most recent studies and articles were searched for applicable citations. Some of the key words searched were: access to higher education; affirmative action; diversity; demand for higher education; supply of higher education; leadership; higher education; and policy.

There are several bodies of literature that address access to higher education. However, this researcher concentrated specifically on the following:

- The philosophical/theoretical framework that explains access to higher education in the United States
- Affirmative Action and diversity as they related to higher education access in the United States
- Policy making as it relates to access to higher education in the United States
- OFI's higher education component
- The philosophical/theoretical framework of South Africa's post-apartheid education system
- SANPHE's higher education component
- Educational leadership as it relates to accessing higher education in both the United States and South Africa

### *Philosophical Framework*

The purpose of this section was to develop a philosophical framework to show the importance of access to higher education to a society.

Access to higher education is a challenge for educators. The higher education landscape has been transformed from major advances in geopolitical, economic, technological changes and the increasing pool of traditionally underrepresented students (Altbach, 1999; Fulton, 1989; Jones, Yonezawa, Ballesteros, & Mehan, 2002; Weber, 1999). Today, all educators around the world face these challenges. These challenges were also noted by the Glion Declaration wherein a group of distinguished Americans

and Europeans associated with higher education announced in May 1998, new initiatives to confront this transformation (Glion Declaration, 1998; Hirsch & Weber, 1999).

The Glion Declaration announced, “this is the moment for both society and the university to reaffirm the social compact, and for their leaders to work together towards the achievement of their common goals” (Glion Declaration, 1998; as cited in Hirsch & Weber, 1999, p. 182). The goals noted in the Declaration are important because they will require new practices of governance and leadership to meet them (Glion Declaration, 1998).

The aim of higher education is to create opportunities through the diffusion of knowledge (Barnett, 1990). In a like manner, the pursuit of truth and objective knowledge, a neutral and open forum for debate, the development of the student’s critical abilities and preserving society’s intellectual culture are other aims and values to create a just society (Barnett, 1990). Furthermore, as the ideals of equity and equal opportunity are associated with access to higher education, it is from this perspective that traditionally underrepresented students perceive access as an important route to opportunities a society has to offer (Chickering, 1999; Messick, 1999; Willingham, 1970).

Access to higher education is enmeshed with issues of equity, diversity, and social justice (Messick, 1999). The research noted that equity is “fairness in assessment” and that it is important “to isolate ideologically based barriers from the practical constraints of distributing scarce resources” (Messick, 1999, p. 4). With respect to diversity, Messick (1999) suggested it is important to balance “the concern for group parity with individual as well as institutional and societal benefits” (p. 4). On social justice, Messick (1999) argued, “the equity issues are often phrased in terms of equal access and treatment as well

as opportunity to learn” (p. 4). From these three issues, it is clear that the central idea is the concern for fairness. The increasing scrutiny that access to higher education is receiving shows the variety of perspectives from political and educational interest groups.

The pursuit of fairness in access to higher education must first come from the political governance and then be implemented at the institutional level (Dewey, 1966; Fulton, 1989; Messick, 1999). At the political governance level, access is co-mingled with ideologically based barriers to protect scarce resources and constituencies’ interests (Dye, 2001; Messick, 1999; Wildavsky, 1979). Berger and Kostal (2002) noted this as well in their study of the demand and supply of enrollment in public higher education. Their study showed, for example, any changes in state appropriations for education or an increase in tuition could affect access to higher education (Berger & Kostal, 2002).

From a power position, access to higher education is a protection of social influence. The significant changes in society are forcing a reconsideration of the traditional approach to higher education policies as groups demand wider access (Callan, 2001). Those who demand this access refer to this as a frustration and “a betrayal of the social contract between the colleges and universities and the citizenry” (Gardner, 1999, p. 23). Freire (1972) made the point that the restriction of access has always been an accepted practice of privileged groups to deny oppressed groups full opportunity to education. As those with economic and political power consolidate their power, it is used to exploit weakness and those who have been oppressed are accused of lacking what they have been denied the right to acquire (Niebuhr, 1960).

The issue of access to education is associated with political power. The oppressed see access to education as a class struggle against those who made them

oppressed (Freire, 1972). Indeed, the oppressed also see access to education as a class struggle for humanization, and being treated as less human leads the oppressed to struggle against those who made them so (Freire, 1972). Minorities will fight for their rights if they are denied them, and the result will be a confrontational engagement between those in society who see their rights in danger of usurpation, and those who are unwilling to give up control of their privileges (Singer, 1999). The essential question, however, is the extent to which access to higher education can be seen as a benefit to an entire society rather than a select few who have traditionally enjoyed this benefit.

### *Policy Making*

The purpose of this section is to discuss how policy making impacts issues of access to higher education.

Policy making is a political process. The making of an educational policy is a process of governance in which both participatory democracy and representative democracy play a role; however, political ideology and values may be dominant factors in the process (Downey, 1988; Dye 2001; Marshall, Mitchell, & Wirt, 1989; Wildavsky, 1979). Marshall et al. (1989) contend that the role of value is significant in policy making and that it dominates the entire process. Policy makers consistently face dilemmas as they have to decide who gets what and when (Marshall et al., 1989). This issue is the essence of policy making and it directly impacts access to higher education.

Davies and Brickell (1960) define policies as guides to discretionary action. This is a significant point in that a leader's discretion could be a critical factor that determines how a policy will or could be implemented.

When studying access to education, a clear definition of policy is important. McLaughlin (2000) states that education policies are political decisions that involve the exercise of power in order to preserve or alter the nature of educational institutions or practices. Downey (1988) emphasizes that an education policy is an authoritative guideline for institutions to show what their intents are in achieving a goal. An education policy is a concrete thing made in one place or time and then transmitted elsewhere to be practiced (Placier, Hall, McKendall, & Cockrell et al., 2000). McLaughlin (2000) asserts that an education policy is a distinct path for action aimed at the preservation or alteration of educational institutions or practices. The slight differences in these definitions are probably due to the philosophical differences in governance, the meaning of power, and the role of government (Fowler, 2000). In any event, the differences do underscore society's intents and priorities in achieving a specific goal.

An education policy takes an explicit meaning as to what needs to be achieved. More specifically, it is about which individuals and groups are included and which are excluded. In addition, an education policy is inextricably tied to overarching questions about the distribution of public resources and to the priorities and incentives — implicit and explicit — which affect government's support for students and institutions (Callan, 2001). The distribution of the public's resources is the goal toward which policy makers in a democracy strive for by doing the greatest good for the greatest number.

As instruments of governance, policies are guidelines for action. An education policy is shaped by various complex interrelated factors and influences and it takes on a very precise meaning once it is documented (McLaughlin, 2000). To understand a policy on access to higher education, one must understand the intentions of the governing



authorities (Downey, 1988). Their intentions are to make decisions on allocation of resources and to prioritizing those decisions.

Implementing a policy is a key leadership challenge. While policies are guidelines for action, the exercise of discretion is key for implementation (Downey, 1988; Knight & Trowler, 2001). Responsiveness and the exercise of discretion will be important leadership attributes in policy implementation. Without these leadership attributes, policies cannot be properly implemented. On the other hand, with these leadership attributes, the policies can be implemented effectively. The discretion for implementation, therefore, is the essence for implementing a policy.

### *Supporting Relevant Research*

The purpose of this section is to summarize some of the relevant research conducted on access programs and practices and student disposition in the United States and South Africa, respectively. Thus, the question of access to higher education is a central issue in this discussion.

#### *Access programs and practices in the United States*

The purpose of this section is to discuss access programs and practices in the United States and its impact on those who have been traditionally discriminated against.

The literature that concerns access programs and practices in the United States will be discussed in this section — literature that focuses on significant institutional initiatives to enhance access for those who have been traditionally underrepresented in higher education.

William G. Bowen, former president of Princeton University, and Derek Bok, former president of Harvard University, studied an extensive database which included

data on eighty thousand undergraduates from twenty-eight colleges and universities for the fall of 1951, the fall of 1976, and the fall of 1989 (Bowen & Bok, 1998). Their longitudinal study was a comprehensive analysis of the impact of affirmative action in higher education admission.

The researchers focused on the affirmative action admission policies of the selected colleges and universities to determine the impact on African and White American students. The results of their research showed that affirmative action does provide access to higher education for minority applicants (Bowen & Bok, 1998). Equally important, their results showed the overall graduation rate for 1989 African American matriculants was 79 percent; for Asian Americans, 96 percent; for Native American, 81 percent; for Hispanics, 90 percent; and Whites 94 percent (Bowen & Bok, 1998, p. 55-57). Thus, affirmative action did provide the means for traditionally underrepresented students to attend higher education institutions and indeed, the majority of the students were able to complete their program of study.

Drummond (1994) in a policy analysis study of access to higher education wanted to determine the compliance activities of the state of Oklahoma and Virginia following the 1969 desegregating order by the federal government. This study was designed using qualitative methodology to see how these states dismantled their segregated institutions by increasing the number of African-American students in previously all-White institutions (Drummond, 1994). More specifically, Drummond's (1994) major research question was, "How was the policy to desegregate student enrollment, as specified by the revised guidelines to desegregate state systems of public higher education, implemented in Oklahoma and Virginia?" (p. 146).

Drummond (1994) used seven themes to analyze the state of Oklahoma and Virginia's responses to the federal government desegregation plan. The themes were "Clarity of Policy, Specificity of Standards, Monitoring, Presence of an Enforcement Agency, Administrative Coordination, Costs and Benefits, and Direct Federal Involvement" (Drummond, 1994, p. 146). The findings showed some differences in themes between Oklahoma and Virginia. Oklahoma, for example, in its mission statement showed a firm commitment; however, Virginia did not (Drummond, 1994). The researcher concluded, "Virginia's defense was that a problem existed with the overall criterion in that whether it applied to each institution's willingness to create a mission or to the system as a whole was unclear" (Drummond, 1994, p. 148).

In terms of policy making and analysis, Drummond (1994) showed the importance of implementation of the federal order. More specifically, several implications from this study showed "the complexity in implementing a legislative mandate into day-to-day administrative actions and the monitoring and specificity of standards" (Drummond, 1994, p. 154). In terms of further research, this researcher recommended the study of how education leaders implement policy at the university level.

In another study, Sadler and Hammerman (1999) examined Harvard University Graduate School of Education's Doctoral Program in Learning and Teaching over a five-year period (1992-1996). The data in this period came from 592 candidates vying for 99 slots. The purpose of the study was to understand the three-stage admission process and to identify any systematic bias that comprises fairness and the implications for other admissions programs. Findings from this study showed the extent to which institutions

must ensure that their admission process does have some degree of fairness, and the necessity of using quantitative tools to examine their subjective ratings in their admission programs especially when raters have different views of a candidate than do their colleagues.

Chatman and Smith (2000) argued that admissions to higher education should be focused less on affirmative action and more on the economic disadvantage of students. They used an assortment of data sources to examine the extent to which economic disadvantage explains race bias in admissions and college attendance patterns, and address the likelihood of reaching racial diversity through economically-based affirmative action (Chatman & Smith, 2000). The researchers first tried to understand the interaction of admissions measures; student performance; and economic, social and geographic factors and to reconsider the validity of the admission measures. Secondly, they wanted to determine whether attendance patterns provide evidence of disparate impact by economic status (Chatman & Smith, 2000).

Their research showed those African-American students face barriers disproportionately. They concluded that it might be possible to accomplish racial diversity targets by ignoring race and instead attacking the social and economic barriers faced by students of all races (Chatman & Smith, 2000). The implication of this study was that economic and social barriers do prevent poor students from attending higher education institutions and that there should be more focus on these factors than on race.

Mumpower, Nath and Stewart (2002) conducted a series of analyses to determine whether the college admission process rejected qualified candidates. Higher education institutions generally consider, among other factors, high school grades, test scores from

the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or ACT (American College Tests), recommendations, essays, and records of extracurricular activity (Mumpower et al., 2002; Young, 2003). The researchers argued that none of these is considered a predictor of future academic performance. Likewise, they noted that the implications of different potential affirmative action policies depend on three factors: selection rate from the applicant pool, base rate of qualified applicants, and the accuracy of performance predictions.

Building on and drawing on judgment and decision making with public policy research completed by H. C. Taylor and J. T. Russell in 1939, Mumpower et al. (2002) used the Taylor-Russell framework to do some of their analysis (as cited in Mumpower et al., 2002). The Taylor-Russell framework “illustrates the tension between the two types of errors inherent whenever decisions based on imperfect information must be made about whether to take action” (Mumpower et al., 2002, p. 64). For example, Type I error is considered a false positive and unqualified candidates are admitted (Mumpower et al., 2002). Type II error is considered a false negative and qualified candidates are rejected (Mumpower et al., 2002).

The researchers noted their findings showed that difference in decision-makers’ ability to predict accurately majority — and minority-group members’ academic performance — creates serious, generally unrecognized complications for affirmative action policy. The implication of this study is that higher education institutions should review their admission procedures to minimize Type I and II errors.

In another study, Mayer-Foulkes (2002) investigated the optimal standards that higher education institutions should set to compete in the market for quality students. It is the belief that higher education institutions compete for their students on the basis of

their reputations and on their institutions' academic standards (Mayer-Foulkes, 2002). One concern for these institutions is that if these standards are set too high or too low, current achievement may decrease, leading to a reduction of their reputation in the future (Mayer-Foulkes, 2002). Also, the researcher argued higher failure rates represent a cost for students that may hamper the institution's reputation (Mayer-Foulkes, 2002).

Some institutions are faced with this dilemma. The decision is whether to impose a higher education standard, at the cost of a higher rate of student failure, or whether to accept for the present a somewhat lower level closer to the current students' abilities (Mayer-Foulkes, 2002).

Mayer-Foulkes' (2002) results supported the inference that academic institutions seeking excellence must recognize that their mission is to maximize the aggregate achievement of their current students. Also, the researcher argued that as an institution succeeds in increasing its student's achievement, it will be rewarded with an increased reputation that will in turn attract better students (Mayer-Foulkes, 2002).

In another study, Berger and Kostal (2002) researched the role of declining financial resources (tuition, fees and state appropriations) on a negative effect on enrollment in higher education. The researchers noted that revisions in the financing of higher education in the 1990s have gradually shifted the burden of paying from the state to the individual. Using a 1990-95 data set from the Digest of Education Statistics, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, they developed an econometric model to analyze the extent to which differing financial resources, most notably tuition and state and local appropriations influenced the enrollment rate in public higher education in the United States.

The results showed that, on the demand side, tuition proved to be the most significant variable — as tuition increases the enrollment rate decreases (Berger & Kostal, 2002). On the supply side the enrollment rate is influenced positively by available funds (except tuition) and the relative size of the higher education sector within a certain state and negatively by the scope of autonomy of colleges and universities (Berger & Kostal, 2002).

The researchers concluded by arguing that their findings had significant policy consequences. For example, they noted, if one of the major goals for public colleges and universities is to maintain a high enrollment rate in higher education then it is important to ensure a reasonable level of tuition and a sufficient amount of state and local appropriations (Berger & Kostal, 2002). For university administrators who are concerned about maintaining access to the institutions for minority students, there must be continuous monitoring of the factors that influence the demand and the supply for higher education.

Thompson and Zumeta (2001) examined the effects of key state policies on private colleges and universities and the relationship between key state policy variables to sustaining private-sector capacity in the face of the higher education access challenge. Their study was based on a study done earlier by Astin and Inouye in 1988 (as cited in Thompson & Zumeta, 2001). Astin and Inouye investigated the causation issue and the relationship between state policy variables and institutional enrollments and enrollment demographics (as cited in Thompson et al., 2001). Astin and Inouye used the federal Higher Education General Information Survey database for the period 1969-82 to identify their variables (as cited in Thompson et al., 2001). They found evidence that increases in

public section tuition in a state might have increased private enrollments. In addition, they found evidence that increases in state spending on student aid were associated with gains in private enrollments, especially enrollments of targeted populations (Thompson et al., 2001).

In replicating Astin-Inouye's study, Thompson and Zumeta (2001) used data from the same database for the period of 1980-85 for over 1,000 private schools. The researchers used regression analysis to analyze the data. Findings from their study were similar to Astin-Inouye's study, i.e., public tuition change is positively associated with private institution enrollments — greater increases in tuition at a private institution's competitive public institutions over the period were systematically associated with larger enrollments at that private school at the end of the period.

Thompson and Zumeta (2001) concluded by arguing that because of the significant costs of building new public institutions, policy makers should understand the effect of state policies on enrollments in public and private institutions. Furthermore, they noted that states might adamantly attempt to redirect some enrollment demand from the public to the private sector by simultaneously increasing public institution prices (tuition) substantially while also expanding need-based student aid (Thompson & Zumeta, 2001). The implication of this study is that it offers insight into the challenges of higher education access with respect to the state policies that affect the demand for and the supply of higher education.

### *Students' Disposition in the United States*

The purpose of this section is to discuss and summarize the relevant research on how students view access to higher education with respect to affirmative action and



diversity — their respective benefits to underrepresented students. Also, institutions' initiatives (e.g. retention programs) designed specifically to help underrepresented students will be discussed.

Investigating student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions, Sax and Arrendondo (1999) used a national sample of over 277,850 college freshmen from 709 colleges and universities. The college freshmen included students from each of the following racial/ethnic groups: Whites (233,193); African-Americans (19,190); Asian-Americans (18,275); and Mexican-Americans (7,192). The data was from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program 1996 Freshman Survey conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California, Los Angeles (Sax & Arrendondo, 1999). The researchers looked into the extent to which college freshmen oppose affirmative action in college admissions.

They found Whites were most likely to agree strongly that affirmative action should be abolished (25.6%), followed by Asian-Americans (16.5%), Mexican-Americans (9.2%), and African-Americans (5.3%) (Sax et al., 1999). On the other hand, they found that African-Americans have the strongest favorable attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions (43.5% disagree strongly that it should be abolished), followed by Mexican-Americans (32.0%), Asian-American (12.8%), and Whites (8.0%)” (Sax & Arrendondo, 1999).

Hurtado, Inkelas, Briggs and Rhee's (1997) study focused on college application behaviors of students from various racial/ethnic groups in order to understand differences in access and college choice. The researchers used data from the National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS: 88/92) and the Beginning Postsecondary Student

Longitudinal Study (BPS: 90/92) to analyze the differences in access and college choice (Hurtado et al., 1987).

Hurtado et al. (1987) then used descriptive analysis and chi-square tests to analyze significant differences in students' college predispositions, choices and outcomes with a sample size of 14,283 students. The findings showed that when asked about the type of institution the student is likely to attend, 75% of Asian American (12<sup>th</sup> grade) students reported they are likely to attend a four-year institution; White students at 62%; African-Americans at 60%; and Latinos at 53% (Hurtado et al., 1997). The results showed significant group differences in plans to attend college. While the study was national in scope, the most important work remains on individual campuses in evaluating the effects of policy decisions and implementation of policy that impact student access (Hurtado et al., 1997).

Brunner (2000) investigated students' perception of the University of Florida's commitment to public relationships and diversity. She argued that the subject of successful relationship management is of particular concern now because the United States' demographics are changing. Moreover, she asserted that it seems if a university chooses to ignore diversity issues, it will lose a significant and strategic opportunity, and possibly incur many unnecessary costs (Brunner, 2000).

Brunner's (2000) research objective was to examine public relationships and to what degree an organization's commitment to diversity affects those relationships. The researcher conducted a quantitative survey of 616 students from the University of Florida student body. A majority of the participants were Caucasian (63%), approximately 12

percent identified themselves as Hispanic/Latino, 11 percent as African/American/Black, 6 percent as Asian, and 4.1 percent as Biracial/Multiracial.

To interpret the results, the researcher used quantitative methodologies such as descriptive statistics and analysis of variance (ANOVA), Pearson's correlation coefficient and coding and interpreting the responses to the open-ended query. On the research question —“What are the students' perceptions of their relationship with the University?”— she concluded the students do agree that the university treated students fairly and that it has the ability to accomplish what it says it would do.

On the other research question —“What are students' perceptions of the University commitment to diversity?”— she concluded that the students perceive the University of Florida to be genuinely committed to diversity.

Brunner's (2000) findings were significant for administrators at the University of Florida. The researcher noted the university's administrators could use the findings to continue to build and maintain better relationships with students and to design programs that promote diversity on campus. On the issue of further research, Brunner (2000) called for the examination of the effect OFI will have on students' beliefs and experiences. Moreover, Brunner (2000) recommended for further research to study diversity at the University of Florida after the OFI has been instituted and to determine whether or not the plan promotes diversity or if it actually limits a university's attempts to diversify its student body.

Terenzini, Cabrera, Colbeck, Bjorklund, and Parente (2001) studied racial and ethnic diversity in the classroom and the benefits to students. In laying the framework for their study, the researchers cited two distinguished educators who supported diversity in

the classroom by claiming that a diverse student body is more educationally effective than a more homogeneous one (Terenzini et al., 2001).

First, former Harvard University President Neil Rudenstine asserted that the fundamental rationale for student diversity in higher education is its educational value (as cited in Terenzini et al., 2001). Second, Lee Bollinger, former president of the University of Michigan, declared that a classroom that does not have a significant representation from members of different races produces an impoverished discussion (as cited in Terenzini et al., 2001). Terenzini et al. (2001) also noted the seal of approval of diversity from a statement published by the Association of American Universities and endorsed by the presidents of 62 research universities which stated: “We speak first and foremost as educators. We believe that our students benefit significantly from education that takes place within a diverse setting” (as cited in Terenzini et al., 2001, p. 510).

In their study, the researchers empirically tested Bollinger’s claim that racially/ethnically homogenous classrooms produce “an impoverished” educational experience (as cited in Terenzini et al., 2001, p. 512). They used a sample of 1,258 engineering students enrolled at all seven of the National Science Foundation-funded Engineering Coalition of Schools for Excellence in Education and Leadership and conducted regression analysis to determine the influence of varying levels of classroom diversity on students’ learning outcomes above and beyond the effects of other variables that may also influence learning (Terenzini et al., 2001).

The 1,258 students completed a survey and responded to questions on their participation of selected courses that had been designed to promote learning through the usage of groups and traditional teaching environments and to determine the influence of

classroom diversity on the students (e.g., lecture and discussion). The analysis showed that classroom diversity is a factor in student learning (Terenzini et al., 2001). The researchers concluded that their findings indicated classroom diversity did have a measurable influence on student learning (Terenzini et al., 2001). This finding was significant to support the argument for affirmative action and race-sensitive admissions in higher education.

Walters (2002) examined the connections between multiculturalism and diversity and minority student performance and retention at Olivet College, a small liberal arts college in Michigan with about 900 students (Walters, 2002). After a racial brawl in 1992, the college initiated a course to reassess its climate and culture that resulted in a major institutional transformation (Walters, 2002). Using a case study method, Walters (2002) noted that the College's administrators challenged its faculty and administrators to heighten their sensitivity for the students and put into place several diversity-related curricular programs.

African-American student retention rate was 66 percent for the 1996-1997 academic year, whereas it was 41 percent in 1995-1996. In 1992, the College had no faculty or staff of color; however, by 1998, the College had 18 of color and this represented 29 percent of the college's faculty and staff (Walters, 2002). Walters (2002) noted that these changes now are creating a more caring and tolerant atmosphere for understanding among the students. These findings show that institution initiatives were important to ensure that retention programs were designed from a diversity perspective in order that access to underrepresented students did not fail.

Good, Halpin, and Halpin (2002) examined whether minority programs have a longitudinal impact on retaining black students. More specifically, they explored if there is an effect on academic achievement as a result of the students' involvement in a support program designed specifically to help them succeed in college.

The setting for the study was at a large land-grant university in the Southeast United States. The university initiated an academic support program for African-American students for the College of Engineering. The program included critical-thinking workshops, an interactive learning laboratory, and Sunday-evening tutorials during the students' freshman year of study. There were 58 African-American students who participated—34 participated in the academic support programs and 24 did not. The researchers conducted an analysis of the 34 and found that program involvement ceased for all students in their sophomore years of study. After the students completed their sophomore year of study, quarter and cumulative grade point averages were collected.

Good et al. (2002) found that the grade point average (4.0 = maximum) for participants in the program was 2.45 versus 2.23 for the nonparticipants. Moreover, in further analysis on the retention patterns of the two groups staying in the engineering program, they found that over three-quarters of the participants in the academic support programs remained. For those who did not participate in the academic support programs, less than half remained. The results also showed that 24 percent of the nonparticipants left for academic reasons (Good et al., 2002). Consequently, the participation in the academic support program seemed to have a significant impact on decisions concerning retention within the College of Engineering (Good et al., 2002). For university administrators, designing academic support programs in order to ensure that their access

programs succeed, they need to continue to pay particular attention to those students who do not have an adequate secondary school education.

In another study, Pogue (2000) examined several historically Black and predominately White higher education institutions' initiatives to determine how they advance access for traditionally underrepresented students. Forty-six institutions participated in the study and they provided data (e.g., high school grade point average, admission test score and high school rank) on their 1990 freshman cohort of students. The researcher used multiple regression techniques and logistics equations to provide actual and predicted graduation rates for the entire data set.

The researcher's major findings were: cost is the major factor that determines whether African American students will attend a certain institution; SAT scores are higher for African American students attending predominately White institutions; and a high percentage of African American students on campus helps to facilitate African American students to graduate (Pogue, 2000). He also noted that at historically Black institutions, students have more opportunities for interaction with their fellow students and faculty and that there is a lack of competition for the interactions — a significant means whereby persistence and graduation are facilitated (Pogue, 2000). On the other hand, the researcher noted that the reverse of this situation — not sufficient time or individuals for African American students to interact with — can bring about a feeling of detachment and a cut off from the institution (Pogue, 2000). Moreover, the researcher also noted that the feelings of isolation — whether perceived or actual — could have an impact on a student's decision to persevere.

The results of this researcher's study (Pogue, 2000) have further implications. For example, he noted that policy makers at any institution (either Black or White) should consider what factors inspire them to respond to the needs of students and how the institution's environment can be further developed to ensure that access programs are advanced.

### *Access programs and practices in South Africa*

The purpose of this section is to discuss the literature that concerns access programs and practices in South Africa — literature that focuses on significant government and institutional initiatives to enhance access for those who have been traditionally underrepresented and discriminated against during the apartheid era.

South Africa's transition to democracy in its first ever-free election in 1994 energized the newly elected government to institute reforms in its education system. This whole process of transformation was fundamentally to increase access, eliminate inequities and abolish all educational discriminatory practices (Koorts, 2000; Lomofsky & Lazarus, 2001; Mabokela, 2001). In essence, the new policies were guided by the universal principles of a human right to basic education and determination to apartheid educational legislation (Lomofsky & Lazarus, 2001). Some of these policies were: South African Schools Act, Higher Education Act and SANPHE. This section will analyze the relevant research on access programs and practices in South Africa's higher education system.

In looking at the demand for post-secondary education in South Africa, Anderson (1999) examined the political dynamics, racial and ideological tensions surrounding the demand for access. The focus of this study was at the University of the Western Cape



(Anderson, 1999). Anderson (1999) noted that the issue to enhance access to post-secondary institutions for disadvantaged students has generated much controversy. The University of the Western Cape embarked on a program to increase enrollment of non-White students who have been discriminated against in the past (Anderson, 1999).

Using a participant-observation methodology, Anderson (1999) reported on the various perspectives of participants on the university's efforts to reform policies designed to increase racial-ethnic, class and gender representation within post-secondary education. One reform program was called Academic Development Program that was designed to transform the university from within by changing pedagogical practices, curriculum, assessment procedures and open admissions policy (Anderson, 1999).

Anderson (1999) found that the university's admissions policy dramatically altered the racial composition of its student body so those African students who have been historically discriminated against could enroll in larger numbers. Anderson (1999) concluded that the lessons learned from the University of Western Cape are relevant to American post-secondary institutions trying to increase access to higher education for disadvantaged students.

In another study, Pedro (1997) analyzed whether the new (post-apartheid) South African government's education policy has the potential to eradicate separate and unequal education and also whether it promotes equality. The researcher analyzed some of the major education policies under South Africa's first democratically elected government. President Mandela's government intended to bring about educational equality and transform education by passing some significant pieces of legislation and policy documents to guide his country's education policy — such as South African

Schools Act of 1996; the White Paper on Education and Training; the Curriculum Framework and the Towards a Language Policy.

The researcher used content analyses as his methodology to analyze the documents. His major findings were that the policies do advance the equalization of South Africa's education — but noted with a caveat that total equality is not possible because certain realities impede this dilemma. The researcher cautioned on the need for a participatory approach in policy making in order for representatives from students, parents and teachers to be included in the relevant discussions and debates. Lastly, he suggested that in either centralized or decentralized policy-making structures, there must be grassroots participation so as to ensure that there is no power abuse within the structures.

#### *Students' Disposition in South Africa*

The purpose of this section is to summarize some of the substantive research on how students view access to higher education in South Africa. Also, institutions' initiatives (e.g., retention programs) designed specifically to help underrepresented students will be discussed.

South African higher education institutions have established initiatives to broaden access, redress educational inequities and to implement SANPHE. Dyasi (1999) investigated the progress towards racial equity in higher education in South Africa. He evaluated the progress in higher education in South Africa in light of the policy changes that took place in the 10-year period 1988-1998 and compared the two 10-year periods, 1978-1988 and 1988-1998.

The researcher found that participation rates in higher education during the apartheid period showed the Afrikaan Universities with the highest level of compliance with the segregationist policies (Dyasi, 1999). Some of these universities had virtually one hundred percent White student bodies (Dyasi, 1999). The Afrikaan Universities are the prestigious universities that received a higher share of government funding (Dyasi, 1999). In the post-apartheid period, there were modest increases in enrollments of non-Afrikaan students in Afrikaan Universities (Dyasi, 1999). For example, by 1998, the University of Stellenbosch, one of the most prestigious Afrikaan Universities, still enrolled eighty percent of its students from its traditional White community (Dyasi, 1999). Whereas, the University of the Orange Free State, a traditional Afrikaan University, by 1998 enrolled sixty percent of its students from the traditional White community (Dyasi, 1999). Dyasi (1999) noted that a dominant barrier for African students entering Afrikaan Universities was the imposition of Afrikaans as a language of instruction while the majority of African students did not speak Afrikaans.

Dyasi (1999) concluded by noting that the issue of race is still the main defining parameter for the degree of participation in higher education in South Africa. Finally, Dyasi (1999) recommended that public policy makers in education have to allow universities to continue to determine the pace of access by allowing them total autonomy on admission decisions.

Mabokela (2001) analyzed student perceptions of institutional racial climate — culture, policies, procedures and practices manifested in the day-to-day operations in the South African higher education system and its impact on access to those who have been traditionally discriminated against. More specifically, she examined how historically

White higher education institutions responded to the new legislation that called for more access. In her research, she noted that many of the inequities in the South African system have been as a result of the discriminatory apartheid policies.

The data sources for her research were questionnaires (1,005 respondents) that were administered to undergraduate students at two traditionally White universities (one was an English-language university and the other was an Afrikaan-language university). At the English-language university, 42 percent of the student body was non-White; whereas at the Afrikaan-language university, 13 percent of the study was non-White (Mabokela, 2001).

At the English-language University, the results showed that the mean responses from both Black and White students were not different (Mabokela, 2001). The researcher attributed this to be as a result of the open atmosphere and the racial makeup at the university. On the other hand, at the Afrikaan-language University, the results showed that the mean responses were statistically significant. The researcher found that Black and Colored students perceived that the university was more hostile and that there was racial conflict on campus. The White students had the opposite perceptions.

The researcher concluded that the racial demographic percentage was the key factor to explain the response patterns observed among students (Mabokela, 2001). Also, she noted that responsive universities must continue to take the initiative to create a diversified atmosphere on their campus as they increase access to higher education.

### *Comparative Education*

This section will focus on the relevant comparative literature in the context of access to higher education.

In view of the similarities and dissimilarities between the evolution and practices of higher education in the U.S. and in South Africa, Eckel (2001) examined the transformation of higher education in the U.S. and South Africa and placed emphasis on the challenges and issues confronting higher education leaders and policy makers. Some of the challenges and issues he noted were the response to emerging societal demands and to new economies, diversifying revenue streams, improving and demonstrating quality while controlling costs, competing with new providers, capitalizing on emerging technologies, and confronting globalization. The researcher argued that educational leaders could no longer afford to lead their institutions in familiar ways and conduct business as usual. He noted as a result of these challenges, institutions' leaders must be cognizant of the transformational issues they face and take appropriate action to effect change.

Eckel's (2001) South African observations were drawn from several campus visits and meetings with scholars, academicians and administrators in the spring of 2000. The U.S. observations came from his involvement with the American Council on Education's (ACE) Project on Leadership and Institutional Transformation which was begun in 1995 with 26 public and private institutions — including community colleges, liberal arts colleges, comprehensive and doctoral universities and research universities.

The researcher in his analysis found that South Africa experienced a profound social and political transformation, moving from repressive apartheid to democracy. He noted the government is struggling to provide the basic needs to the majority of the population. The government's Higher Education White Paper in 1997 articulated that the challenge is to redress past inequities. The U.S. on the other hand is not facing the

political and social transitions as in South Africa because the U.S.'s higher education system is decentralized and policy matters are at the state-level and at governing boards in the private university sector.

In a like manner, however, Eckel remarked that institutions' responses to the challenges in the two countries are somewhat similar. In South Africa, the transformation mandate centered on the national government's White Paper that focused on redressing past inequities in the education system. In the U.S, however, he argued that transformation issues are defined locally where institutional leaders are responsible for identifying and articulating the pressures they face.

In South Africa, he found institution leaders are faced with the challenge to create a legitimate decision-making process that is effective as well as transparent, open, and inclusive (Eckel, 2001). Further, and more important, South African institutions have very little trial or break-in periods to test new processes and education leaders must rely upon trial and error for the issues that require immediate resolution (Eckel, 2001). He also noted that the important similarities South African and U.S. institutions share are those concerned with access, affordability and quality (Eckel, 2001). And finally, in terms of access, he argued that institutions' leaders in both countries would ask, "How do we increase access for underrepresented populations?" (Eckel, 2001, p. 113).

King (2001b) examined whether comprehensive racial inclusion is an elusive goal for educational institutions in South Africa and the United States. He noted that racial inclusion should be viewed on a continuum, with numerical and comprehensive inclusion lying at each extreme. He argued that numerical inclusion signifies the degree to which previously excluded groups have access to social, educational, political, and economic

arenas (King, 2001b). Also, he asserted that comprehensive inclusion requires institutions to remove barriers to access, adopt retention strategies to enhance student performance, and to structure a welcoming academic and social environment representative of all major cultural groups (King, 2001b).

King (2001b) analyzed and compared the proportions of Blacks and Whites at a South African University for 1990, 1993, and 1995. After the end of apartheid, the University sought ways to increase the enrollment of Black South Africans. The researcher found that the increased enrollment of more Black South Africans was successful because the university changed its admission criteria — relying on a student's potential rather than on prior exposure to academic materials — and by distributing financial aid and making student assignments for residential accommodations to those in need. This was necessary because of the inferior secondary education the majority of Black South Africans have had and which resulted in Black students having an inferior education and being ill prepared for higher education (King, 2001b). The researcher found that the overall enrollment of Black South Africans at the university increased from 15.6 percent in 1990 to 25.8 percent in 1995 (King, 2001b).

In the United States, however, King (2001b) found some institutions are reluctant to change in order to respond to the challenges faced by African American and other racial minority group members (King, 2001b). He nevertheless found that most institutions in the U.S. continue to rely on standardized tests in their admission criteria and which to some degree restrict access. King concluded by suggesting that the University in South Africa could be used as a model for comprehensive inclusion for other institutions in the United States. It should be noted that some researchers have

alleged there is racial bias on the Standardized Aptitude Tests (SATs). While some researchers asserted that the bias was not intentional, the Educational Testing Service nevertheless continues to look to have a more fair, sensitive and valid SAT test (Young, 2003).

Makoni, Moody, Sr., and Mabokela (2001) in a comparative analysis of provision for education of Blacks in the United States and South Africa examined the development of policies and practices in both countries. The researchers noted that in South Africa today, the primary issue is to redress past inequity and to provide more access for those who have been disbarred from entering the country's higher education system as a result of the apartheid discriminatory laws (Makoni et al., 2001). The development of educational policies under apartheid were intended specifically to discriminate against non-White students — however, the apartheid policies were effective against Black South Africans as it was intended to be and its efficacy far-reaching in its discriminatory intent (Makoni et al., 2001).

In South Africa's comparison with the United States, the researchers noted that there are some parallels. Early in the United States' history and during the period of slavery, Black people were prohibited from all forms of education. After the end of slavery, the discrimination against Blacks in the southern United States was distinct and somewhat similar to South Africa's apartheid policies (Makoni et al., 2001).

The researchers argued that the American experience following court rulings such as *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) to increase access is applicable to South Africa and it has comparable implications for South Africa (Makoni, et al., 2001). They



concluded that as South Africa moves to redress past inequities, it could learn much from the American educational experience.

### *University Leadership through Policy Change*

The purpose of this section is to review and summarize some of the relevant literature on leadership related to implementing policies in higher education institutions.

Higher education institutions are undergoing a significant amount of change as new programs and policies are established to alter admissions criteria (Bargh, Bocock, Scott, & Smith, 2000; Davies, Hides, & Casey, 2001; Eckel, 2001; King, 2001a; Knight & Trowler, 2001; Kulati, 2000; Orfield, 1998; Wagner, 1989). The major challenge for an educational leader now is to balance the governing of his or her institution and effect change that is mandated by governmental authorities (Bargh, Bocock, Scott, & Smith, 2000; Davies, Hides, & Casey, 2001; Eckel, 2001; King, 2001a; Knight & Trowler, 2001; Kulati, 2000; Orfield, 1998; Wagner, 1989).

Implementing a policy of change ultimately depends on leadership (Davies, Hides, & Casey, 2001; Downey, 1988; Drucker, 1999; Wagner, 1989). In terms of implementation, a policy may or may not make it easier for an institution's leadership to do what they want to do, but the leadership's discretion in implementing the policy is of considerable importance (Bennis, 1999; Covey, 1999; Davies, Hides, & Casey, 2001; Downey, 1988; Drucker, 1999; Sergiovanni, 1992; Wagner, 1989). Providing access to higher education for those traditionally underrepresented in colleges and universities, the leaders' discretion will essentially determine the degree of success of the policy (Davies, Hides & Casey, 2001; Dever, 2001; Downey, 1988; Mossberg, 2001; Wagner, 1989).

While the role of leadership is critical in implementing a policy, it is nevertheless enmeshed with several theories and concepts.

The literature on leadership in higher education exhibits the major challenges that leaders confront. According to Bass (1981), leadership is “a universal human phenomenon” (p. 5) and while there is a plethora of literature on leadership, there is no consistent definition of leadership (Davies, Hides, & Casey, 2001). In spite of this, most definitions of leadership have a common theme, “indicating that a leader has the ability to influence a group of individuals towards achievement of a particular goal” (Davies, Hides, & Casey, 2001, p. 1027; Drucker, 1999).

Theories of leadership involve theories of change (Drucker, 1999; Knight & Trowler, 2001). Nash (1929) noted that leadership is influencing change in the conduct of people and this definition will be used as a guide for the remainder of this section. It should be noted, however, that the assumption should not be implied that Nash’s definition is the controlling one for this study. It is used here as an introduction to this review as it makes a connection to the effect of change. Other leadership theories and concepts will of course be discussed where appropriate.

For higher education institutions, the management of change has important consequences (Bargh, Boccock, Scott, & Smith, 2000; Dever, 2001; Mossberg, 2001; Rhodes, 2001). Higher education leaders will find it difficult to implement changes due to anachronistic divisions in their institutions and also within powerful political governance entities (Bargh, Boccock, Scott, & Smith, 2000; Dever, 2001; Drucker, 1999; Mossberg, 2001). Knight and Trowler (2001) noted that there are five perspectives on

change: bureaucratic process; conflict and bargaining; collegial; social practice; and technical-rational.

This bureaucratic process perspective focuses on those in the organization and on the implementation of policy and that “the exercise of discretion is a key issue” (Knight et al., p. 4). The conflict and bargaining perspective sees “the outcomes of change as resulting from battles over scarce resources” (Knight & Trowler, 2001, p. 6). The collegial approach to change perspective included “the building of consensus (or at least the accommodation of change) if change is to be instituted effectively” and there is a continuous need to build supportive collegial relationships (Knight et al., 2001, p. 9). The social practice perspective on change focuses on the learning to change and there is “an accommodation of competing identities, values and goals in social action” (Knight et al., 2001, p. 12). The technical-rational perspective on change emphasizes efficient, goal or vision-directed processes in organizations (Knight et al., 2001).

The concept of influencing others from within a power relationship is significant for those who have a stewardship responsibility to implement a policy. One of the most significant contributors to leadership theory was J. M. Burns. Burns (1978) defined leadership as a process of “engaging and mobilizing the human needs and aspirations of followers” (p. 50), and transformational leadership as “a relational concept that occurs when persons engage with one another in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (p. 20). Burns (1978) argued that transformational leaders are concerned with values such as liberty, justice and equality. He defined transactional leaders as those who clearly define goals and expectations for followers, and follower satisfaction is based on performance and contingent reward from

leaders. Also, Burns (1978) argued that transformational leaders go beyond the bureaucratic actions of transactional leadership and ultimately build on followers' need for meaning. More important, Burns (1978) further contended that leaders have enormous influence over their followers and this is particularly true for those in distinguished and respected positions.

Tichy and Devanna (1986) define transformational leadership as one to lead higher education organizations through change and that these leaders are viewed as change agents. Bass and Avolio (1994) argued that all change and transformation efforts in higher education require a transformational leadership style.

Change within an educational institution needs the support of many individuals. Fullan (1993) and Senge (1990) refer to this as a collegial approach to change. They pointed out that leaders in deploying a strategy must have the support of others. In the instance of providing access to higher education, the president of a university must have the support of some of his key officers such as the Director of Admissions charged with recruiting new students.

Dever (2001) introduced the metaphor "chaos" to explain the role of leadership in higher education. Chaos theory is what Gleick (1987) referred to as the disorder in organizational environments. Dever (2001) built on Gleick's (1987) work and argued that chaos theory offers a usable model for leaders in a learning environment (Senge, 1990). Dever (2001) noted that a leader in a higher education institution is in the best position to make sure that complacency is unacceptable. In a learning environment, the "well-tempered leader" can chart the organization's destiny by using collegiality to take

corrective steps to respond to new challenges (Covey, 1999; Dever, 2001, p. 200; Senge, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1992).

A leader's perspective has immense implications within an organization (Mossberg, 2001). In light of this, Mossberg (2001) argued on the value of the use of chaos theory in leadership roles in academe as a result of the continual pressure to reform (Gleick, 1987). The climate within higher education can sometimes be flexible and inflexible and the leadership plays a key role to guide the organization (Mossberg, 2001). It is indeed the leadership's perspective that will steer the organization when planning to implement new changes in policy that could result in institutional chaos (Gleick, 1987; Mossberg, 2001).

A leader's ability to employ a strategy is important to achieve the goal to increase access to higher education (Gleick, 1987; Mossberg, 2001). While the idea of access could be trying for educational leaders, it is the leaders' actions that must nevertheless be analyzed as the concept of access is considered a significant pressure for social equality (Covey, 1999; Drucker, 1999; Fulton & Ellwood, 1989). The role of education leaders therefore to create access opportunities for minorities is indeed a central point.

Educational leaders have important roles within their institutions in achieving access to higher education. Wagner (1989) noted while the leaders' policies generally determine the degree of success in widening access, the support of others in the institution is also critical. Wagner (1989) also pointed out a generous government and sympathetic funding bodies, using the exhortatory and financial tools at their disposal, would make the task of widening access easier. But they are neither necessary nor sufficient conditions for access to occur; "responsive institutions are" (Wagner, 1989, p.

161). It is with this idea that this study will explore how educational leaders use their discretion in implementing OFI and SANPHE at their respective institutions.

The president of a university often dominates the dynamics of implementing a policy at a higher education institution. Rhodes (2001) noted the president is one of the most powerful positions in a university and it requires forthright leadership to create the atmosphere for embracing change. Also, the president's dominance and role are critical as to how the direction of the organization will be charted in implementing a policy (Bargh, Boccock, Scott, & Smith, 2000; Rhodes, 2001). This is a key point as it refers to the exercise of discretion and why this is important in implementing a policy (Downey, 1988; Knight & Trowler, 2001). The responsiveness and the exercise of discretion in implementing a policy are what Knight et al. (2001) refer to as a change process.

In implementing a policy, leadership is generally necessary to drive the change. Leaders create "the vision, communicate the policy and deploy the strategy throughout a higher education institution" (Davies, Hides, & Casey, 2001, p. 1025). Rhodes (2001) noted that leaders must lead and have the persuasive influence to effect change. Depending on the soundness of the change, the leader of an educational institution is generally a major factor in creating the vision and deploying the strategy (Knight & Trowler, 2001; Rogers, 1995; Wolcott, 1977).

On the other hand, Bell (2001) explored the tacit conceptions of the phenomena of transformation and leadership in higher education. This was a means of "understanding Historically Black Universities' institutional leaders' perceptions of the concept transformation and of the process of leading change" (p. 10). He used ethnographic design and the case study to explore the phenomena of transformation and leadership.

Bell (2001) found no evidence of an African style or mode of leadership; however, one central idea did emerge. He found that leadership in an Afro-centric context, “was highly contextual and firmly grounded in the need for relationships, both formal and informal” (Bell, 2001, p. 153). Moreover, Vice-Chancellors acknowledged that “the essence of leadership lay in the ability of leaders to nurture personal relationships outside of the formal structures and the outcomes of informal relationships had an impact on their ability to lead and govern in formal contexts” (Bell, 2001, p. 153). Finally, Bell (2001) concluded by noting that in higher education, vice-chancellors will continue to play a significant role toward the trend of cooperative governance.

### *Conclusion*

The literature supports the view that higher education institutions are grappling with the issue of access. Historically, both in the United States and the Republic of South Africa, access to higher education has been restricted to those not in the mainstream of the population. The societal demands for access to higher education are now bringing about demands for innovative leadership for increasing access to those who have been traditionally discriminated against.

Public policies such as OFI and SANPHE have been implemented to redress issues related to access. The literature reflects the theme that higher education leaders have some discretion in implementing policies that address issues such as access, affirmative action and diversity. More importantly, the literature review supports the need for an inquiry to understand how higher education leaders have implemented OFI and SANPHE.

This research draws on several perspectives as they relate to access to higher education. The perspectives are: *race conscious admissions criteria; affirmative action; diversity; redress of past inequities; human rights; and process of policy change*. While each perspective has its own base, the combination of all the perspectives guided the analysis and helped frame the issues on how educational leaders implement policies that redress past inequities and expand access to higher education.

The next chapter details the research methodology (qualitative paradigm), its rationale and other salient issues.



## CHAPTER THREE

### METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the procedures and methods used to conduct this research on access to higher education in Florida and South Africa. This chapter begins with a rationale for a qualitative approach and discusses other salient methodological issues central to this research.

#### *Rationale for a Qualitative Approach*

The research questions determined the methodology approach for this study. The research questions were essentially to understand the assumptions and processes for the establishment of educational policies and how senior leaders implemented the policies. Thus, this study's focus was to inquire, understand, interpret and report the emergent themes or insights.

A qualitative research approach fundamentally seeks to get a better understanding of the essence and meaning of the subject matter and the participant's point of view (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Kvale, 1996). Other researchers (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Eisner, 1998; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Merriam, 1998) have also noted the value of this approach to seek and explain data gathered from participants through interviews. To inquire and understand a participant's perspective, Guba and Lincoln (1981) recommended the naturalistic inquiry. This method was used in this study. Naturalistic inquiry essentially seeks to explain and interpret a participant's reality

(Guba & Lincoln, 1981). This process required an exploratory stance to glean and bring together the participant's reality (Guba & Lincoln, 1981).

This insight into a participant's reality is to a large extent based on a researcher's ability to analyze and filter the data obtained in the interviews (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Kvale, 1996; Merriam, 1998). This researcher used these steps to explain and bring meaning to the data.

In explaining the emergent insights, the grounded theory approach was used. Grounded theory is a flexible analytic strategy to "compare data to data, concept to concept and category to category" in order to generate theory (Charmaz, 2003, p. 255; Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

#### *Site Selection*

The purpose of this section is to discuss the reasoning in selecting the higher education institutions to do the fieldwork.

Two prestigious universities, one in Florida and the other in South Africa, were the foci of this study — in accordance with the Informed Consent Agreement, the names of both universities will not be revealed. Both have a special historical role in their respective communities and are very influential in setting trends that other universities generally follow. Both universities began as traditionally White universities. The South African University is an English speaking one.

#### *Purposeful Sampling Strategies*

The purpose of this section is to discuss the strategies used to collect data. The researcher used purposeful sampling strategies to collect the data from senior administrators and key individuals involved in crafting the policies. McMillan &

Schumacher (1997) discussed several procedures associated with purposeful sampling. Two of their procedures were used in this study so as to maximize the value of the information obtained from a small sample so as to yield the most important and useful information (Creswell, 2002; McMillan & Schumacher, 1997). First, reputational-case sampling was used to select experts familiar with the policies. Second, concept/theory-based sampling was used to select information-rich individuals or situations directly related to this study.

By using purposeful sampling, the researcher would more likely find those individuals who are the most knowledgeable in the implementation of the One Florida Initiative (OFI) and the South African National Plan for Higher Education (SANPHE). Also, this technique enabled the researcher to obtain those individuals' perspectives and then focused and analyzed specific actions used to implement the policies.

#### *Researcher Role*

The purpose of this section is to discuss the role of the researcher. The researcher was an interviewer, an observer and an analyst. As an interviewer, the researcher aimed to achieve an understanding of how the leaders at the university in Florida and South Africa's university implemented OFI and SANPHE, respectively.

As an observer, the researcher will explain and describe what has been observed. Because observations are fundamentally important, they were noted as early as practicable in field notes (Bodgan & Biklen, 1998; Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Equally important, the observations provided the context to show how the policies have been implemented and how the university's leadership has enacted program(s) to implement their respective policy (Creswell, 2002; McMillan & Schumacher, 1997). In addition, the

researcher triangulated the data from document analysis with interviews to understand and clarify the context within which the policies were implemented (Bodgan & Biklen, 1998; Creswell, 2002; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; McMillan & Schumacher, 1997).

### *Ethical Considerations*

The purpose of this section is to discuss the ethical considerations related to this study. This research aimed to inquire what the personal thoughts of education and political leaders are in the development and implementation of the OFI and the SANPHE. Each participant was given an Informed Consent Letter (see Appendix E) that described the purpose of the study. In addition, the researcher explained in detail to each of the participants all aspects of the research and how the data will be reported. Approval from the Institutional Research Board (see Appendix F) was obtained and no ethical issue was raised in this study.

### *Data Collection Strategies*

This section discusses the data collection strategies. The primary objective of data collection strategies was to gather data to answer the research questions.

Another objective was to corroborate and triangulate the data (Bodgan & Biklen, 1998; Creswell, 2002; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; McMillan, & Schumacher, 1997). However, as data were triangulated, the researcher modified or changed the collection strategy to keep it consistent with reformulated research questions (Bodgan & Biklen, 1998; Creswell, 2002; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; McMillan & Schumacher, 1997).

*Qualitative Interviews.* This section explains the procedures the researcher used to conduct the interviews. The data collection strategy included interviews with senior education leaders and a policy maker. This researcher relied on extensive use of in-depth interviews for this study as they provided the richest information and the opportunity to get an insight to understand more about how the policies were implemented. Researchers such as Kahn and Cannell (1957) defined interviewing as “a conversation with a purpose” (p. 149). Moreover, Holstein and Gubrium (1995) pointed out that interviewing is a mode of systematic inquiry to extract information. It is through these approaches that the interviews were conducted.

The individuals to be interviewed were treated as participants rather than as objects or subjects. By using this approach, the researcher ensured that each individual interviewed was treated as a conversational partner (Lofland, 1971; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). This congenial approach enabled the researcher to obtain personal and in-depth views from the individual being interviewed.

The interviews were focused discussions. These discussions relied on a mix of structured and semi-structured questions (see Appendix G). During the interview, the researcher requested that each interviewee reflect and explore the questions in depth.

This researcher tape-recorded all interviews. The interviews were guided by open-ended questions to get the participants’ thoughts and feelings about the implementation of OFI and SANPHE. The interviews explored the perceptions and insights of those who have had a direct role in the policy making and implementation at the selected universities.

Next, interviews of *key administrative staff* at the institutional level (President, Provost in Florida and Vice-Chancellor and Registrar in South Africa) were conducted to develop an understanding of how the policies were implemented at each respective institution. Sufficient time was allowed for all the interviews and an arrangement for follow-up interviews was made.

With the permission of the interviewees, all the interviews were taped and transcribed by this researcher. The researcher composed field notes of thoughts and observations and used these to triangulate with other data to clarify the context in which the leaders of the institutions have implemented the policies to increase access to higher education.

Interviews and discussions with government officials who were involved in the process to craft SANPHE were conducted to understand the conceptual framework, the philosophical assumptions and political processes that contributed to the development of both documents. Several attempts were made by this researcher to contact high-ranking State of Florida officials to interview but those attempts were futile. Essentially, the overall objective of both documents was to improve the access to education for the citizens of Florida and South Africa, and the analysis of the documents and the interviews showed how this was accomplished.

Each participant in this study was given a copy of the Informed Consent Letter and asked to sign it to confirm their understanding of their role in this research.

The individuals interviewed were the President and Provost of a university in Florida, Vice-Chancellor and Registrar of a traditionally White and English university in South Africa and a senior education official in the South African Ministry of Education

responsible for higher education issues. All the interviews were conducted on site by this researcher.

### *Data Analysis*

This section discusses the approaches (political and content analysis) to analyze the data. The data sets were field notes, interview transcripts, documents and existing data. The researcher's thoughts throughout the analysis were a reflective process so as to discover patterns and themes in the data. This process guided the researcher to reach a better understanding and build a coherent interpretation of the data (Lofland, 1971; McMillan & Schumacher, 1997). Marshall & Rossman's (1999) approach to inductive analysis procedures was used in this study—their approach specifies these general guidelines:

- Organizing the data
- Generating categories, themes and patterns
- Coding the data
- Testing the emergent understandings
- Searching for alternative explanations
- Writing the report (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 152)

Furthermore, for example, managing the data in chunks enabled the researcher to bring meaning to the data (Lofland, 1971; Marshall & Rossman, 1999). The researcher was flexible to move back and forth from the raw data in developing a sense of the data and capturing the perspectives of the interviewees. While developing an understanding of the data is foremost, two approaches were used to present the results. First, identifying themes and making interpretations were used to uncover underlying concepts or theories

(Bodgan & Biklen, 1998; Lofland, 1971). Second, the grounded theory approach was used to find and clarify meanings (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

*Political Analysis.* The purpose of this section is to discuss the procedures to analyze the policies. To analyze OFI and SANPHE, it would be essential to first understand the contextual and political dimension of how these policies were crafted. Further understanding of the role of political sentiments gave a better insight into the political processes that contributed to the establishment of the policies (Dye, 2001; Marshall, Mitchell & Wirt, 1989; Wildavsky, 1979).

The naturalistic and participant-oriented approach discussed by McMillan & Schumacher (1997) was used to evaluate how each policy was crafted. These researchers noted that the naturalistic and participant-oriented approach is essentially to understand the significance and substance of the participants' perspectives in relation to the crafting of the policy (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997). Generally, in this approach, it was important to get the perspectives of the key participants who were central in the policy making. This was achieved through interviews to discover purposes and conceptualize issues and themes (McMillan & Schumacher 1997).

The general goal of policy analysis is to study the effects of a policy. Several researchers have argued that education policies are legislative directives that originate after argumentative debates and then institutional actors are compelled to implement them (Dye, 2001; Levinson, & Sutton, 2001; Wildavsky, 1979). The researcher used the policy analysis research approach to evaluate the overall effectiveness of OFI and SANPHE.



OFI and SANPHE are redistributive policies. A redistributive policy is one that shifts resources from one social group to another and where governmental authorities seek either to modify the conditions of conduct or manipulate the environment where the policies have to be implemented (Lowi & Ginsberg, 1994). Moreover, with a redistributive policy, the governmental authorities seek certain social and political objectives (Lowi & Ginsberg, 1994). Both policies seek to achieve certain social and political objectives by addressing the issue of minority under-representation in universities.

Some policies are government directives that must be implemented. For educational leaders who have considerable discretion in policy implementation, their approach may be different from governmental authorities. Consequently, educational leaders would be in a position to implement the policies in such a way that fits their discretion. The use of policy analysis enabled this researcher to understand and report how educational leaders at the selected universities responded to the OFI and the SANPHE and how they implemented these policies.

*Content analysis.* The purpose of this section is to discuss how the content analysis procedure was achieved. Content analysis is a research method used to determine the presence of certain words, concepts or themes within texts. As a research tool, content analysis can be advantageous because of its versatility and its use on manageable categories to make inferences (Hodson, 1999; Krippendorff, 1980; Merriam, 1998; Neuendorf, 2002; Weber, 1985). In this study, the researcher used content analysis not only as a tool to examine words or phrases (*manifest analysis*), but also to focus on what the words and phrases mean (*latent analysis*).

While there are many ways to do content analysis, a look at the views of several prominent researchers shows the versatility and value of this research technique. The researchers, Hodson (1999) and Neuendorf (2002) for example, noted that content analysis is a research technique that summarizes quantitative analysis of messages. Two other researchers, Krippendorff (1980) and Weber (1985), noted the value of content analysis by stating that it is the making of valid inferences from data to their context. As a research technique, Neuendorf (2002) noted that content analysis is a systematic, objective, quantitative analysis of message characteristics.

The two principal policy documents analyzed in this research were OFI and SANPHE. The researcher made use of various characteristics of this methodological approach to effectively identify the themes and the deeper meanings of messages in these policy documents. Some important characteristics of content analysis are *manifest* and *latent* content identification of the documents and the description of how validity and reliability are developed. A description follows as to how these issues were expanded for clarity of understanding.

In determining what messages reside in the documents, manifest and latent content analysis was an essential component of the methodological approach used in this study. Gray and Densten (1998) explained manifest content analysis as those elements such as themes, concepts or variables that are physically present and countable in the document that is being analyzed. In addition, researchers such as Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black (1998) described latent content analysis as unobserved themes, concepts or variables. In this study, both manifest and latent analyses were used to determine what the policy documents mean in relation to access to higher education.

The substantive variables and concepts related to access to higher education were identified after the review of the literature and both policies (OFI and SANPHE). In this study, variables and concepts that define access to higher education include *race-conscious admission criteria, affirmative action, diversity and redress of past inequities*. Actions to address these variables and concepts help increase access to higher education. Similarly, actions that do not address these variables and concepts in admission criteria generally tend to decrease access to higher education.

The first step of this analysis was to prepare a dependable and consistent coding instrument. The coding instrument was essentially developed to get an independent point of view on whether each of the policy documents as stated give the assurance (steps will be taken to either increase access, or corrective action to increase access or redress or remedy inequities) that access to higher education will be increased for those who have been traditionally discriminated against. The coding instrument assisted the coders—“a person who assigns scores to cases or responses” with reference to the coding instrument (Manheim, Rich & Willnat, 2002, p. 421). The instrument was not pilot tested because the research questions did not require it. However, it was decided at the start of this study that the value of a content analysis on both policies was important. Hence, a decision was made to get an independent and impartial point of view rather having this researcher comment on the policies. The coding results and comments received from the coders showed that this was a sound decision.

Two individuals (associate professors) were selected to code and they were given the appropriate training to ensure their comprehension of the documents and material to be analyzed. A coder is an individual who checks the document for the presence of the

variables and descriptors that indicate access to higher education (Hodson, 1999; Krippendorff, 1980; Neuendorf, 2002). Additionally, the coders' judgment were solicited to determine their perceptions of the policies and what they would have liked to see included in each of the policies.

In order to avoid inference inconsistencies, all the variables required clarity in their definitions and meaning. Hodson (1999) noted that excessive inference erodes reliability and, as a result, forethought and consideration should be taken to avoid variables and concepts of higher education that are abstract. However, if there is an abstract concept, it must be "disaggregated into simpler components that can be reliably coded" (Hodson, 1999, p. 26). More important, Hodson (1999) noted that these simpler components are necessary so that inferences can be made explicit and kept under the control of the researcher. This researcher followed this guidance in the study.

A Likert scale was used to measure the presence of the access-to-higher education variables (race-conscious admission criteria, affirmative action and diversity) in the policy documents (Hodson, 1999; Krippendorff, 1980; Neuendorf, 2002). The levels of agreement are 1= Strongly Agree; 2= Agree; 3= Neutral (Neither Agree nor Disagree); 4=Disagree; and 5= Strongly Disagree.

Reliability is the extent to which the category-coding procedure yields the same results on repeated trials (Neuendorf, 2002). Also, reliability is the consistency of data ~~resulting from the content analysis and between the coders.~~ The keys to reliability are the thoughtful definition of concepts, clear coding protocol, and careful collection and checking of data (Hodson, 1999).

Intercoder reliability is an important key concept in content analysis because it defines and specifies the degree of consistency between coding conducted by the researcher and the independent coders. Similarly, it is important so as to show that coding of the variables was not limited to use only by this researcher. While there are no acceptable standards for intercoder reliability (Krippendorff, 1980), this researcher expected the reliability coefficient for this study to exceed 0.70, which is considered a reliable coefficient of agreement between the researcher and the independent coder.

### *Conclusion*

The overall intent of this study was to explore and examine the issues educational leaders face in implementing OFI and SANPHE. Providing access to higher education to those who have been traditionally discriminated against has been challenged in the courts. For educational leaders, these challenges are complex and commingled with political, economical and philosophical themes. How the OFI and the SANPHE have been implemented depend to a large extent on the discretion of leaders at their respective educational institutions.

For the purpose of this study, qualitative analysis provided a highly structured and thorough process of collecting and analyzing data. It also provided a paradigm to inquire, evaluate and interpret data. In order to extract the gravity and significance of the data, qualitative analysis also provided the framework to extract the emergent themes across the participants in this study.

The next chapter discusses the data and its analysis.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

The aims of this chapter are to present and analyze the data. In the Introduction section below, I would like first to briefly paint a picture to conceptualize my insight about my experiences to arrange and conduct the interviews in Florida and South Africa. Then, the data and analysis are presented in the following seven sections:

- Political Analysis
- Content Analysis of the both One Florida Initiative (OFI) and the South African National Plan for Higher Education (SANPHE)
- Textural Summary
- Textural Analysis
- Comparing Florida and South Africa
- Themes and Making Sense of Them
- Conclusion

#### *Introduction*

After the research topic and questions were determined, I selected the two universities to conduct my fieldwork— one in the State of Florida (a traditionally White) and the other in South Africa (a traditionally White and English). I encountered minor difficulties to arrange the interviews even though my participants' had very demanding schedules. All of the participants are senior officials in their organizations and they agreed to be interviewed.

My first three interviews were in South Africa. At first I was ambivalent to go but when I arrived at my destination, I was certain it was the right decision. For me, it was an educational experience.

As my first trip to South Africa, the effects of apartheid immediately struck me. Looking around, you can see who owns the wealth and who does not. While the majority of the Black South Africans were poor, they nevertheless were very courteous and friendly. In conversations with many of them, they noted the same general theme: they said they were angry about the apartheid ideology, but now they are happy their country is free.

I interviewed two senior university officials who were both White and I was impressed by their dedication to their institution's mission and their country. They were very frank in the interviews and answered all my questions. They said they enjoyed their jobs. While they could earn more money in private industry, they felt they would make a more positive impact for their country by increasing access to higher education in their current positions.

The South African University, which is about 100 years old, has a very pleasant campus setting, nestled on a hill and surrounded by historical buildings and large trees. It has a feeling of a respected academic institution and comparable to most American universities in its size and scope.

The interview with the South African Ministry of Education official was productive. He was also frank and shared his insight as to the challenges his country is facing in higher education and the issues surrounding the implementation of the SANPHE.

My interviews with the president and the provost of the university in Florida were productive. Both officials were very open about their philosophical beliefs on access and discussed candidly the challenges they faced in implementing OFI.

The university in Florida is over 100 years old. It has a large campus by American standards and foliated with a variety of trees that represents Florida's lush semi-tropical environment. It has a feeling of a vibrant academic campus and an exciting place to be.

In sum, all the interviews were successful in the context of getting a better understanding of the participants' philosophical beliefs, experiences and perspectives. I obtained a broad and excellent coverage of data from the conversations. The data and analysis are now presented in the respected sections below.

### *Political Analysis*

The genesis of OFI was contentious. At the time of the discussion and debate on the merits of OFI, affirmative action was being intensely debated in the United States. Proposition 209 in California was a major catalyst for the debate in Florida and Governor Jeb Bush wanted to end affirmative action programs in the State. The movement to bring a similar proposition called the Florida Civil Rights Initiative (FCRI) to Florida failed when the Florida Supreme Court ruled that FCRI did not meet the state's requirement to be placed on the state's ballot. While there were discussions and debates in the state Capitol on the need to end affirmative action in the state, the Governor signed Executive Order 99-281 as a political compromise to FCRI on November 9, 1999. The Executive Order ended the use of race as a factor in the state's university admission criteria.



On the other hand, the genesis of SANPHE was a formal response to other official government studies to determine how to transform the country's higher education system. In 1994, when South Africa elected Mandela in its first free national election, the new government was faced with a monumental task to fix its segregated higher education system. The transition from apartheid and minority rule to democracy was peaceful despite the suffering the majority of the people faced. The new government believed the country's higher education system had to be transformed quickly to redress past inequalities and provide increased access irrespective of race, gender, age or creed. This transformation was essential for the government to create new opportunities for its people and compete in the world economy.

### *Content Analysis*

This section discusses the results from the content analysis of OFI and the SANPHE. The policies had specific purposes — OFI was essentially to remove race as a factor in the state of Florida's public university admissions — and SANPHE was intended to redress past inequities in higher education in South Africa.

The intent of the content analysis was to determine whether each policy as stated gave the assurance that steps would be taken to increase access for those who had been traditionally discriminated against. Two coders (academic professionals) were used to determine the content analysis of both documents. The coders will be referred to as Coder One<sup>1</sup> and Coder Two<sup>2</sup> and they completed the analysis during the period,

---

<sup>1</sup> Coder One is an Associate Professor and a department chair at a public university in the State of Florida. Her research interests are: pre-service teacher preparation and transition from school to adult life for youth with disabilities. She visited South Africa to present a research paper at a professional conference.

<sup>2</sup> Coder Two is an Associate Professor at a public university in the State of Florida. His research interests are research methods, Southern politics in society and the U.S. Presidency. Coder Two never visited South Africa.

December 2003 to January 2004.

The instructions to the coders were the same. Each was given a copy of OFI, SANPHE and the coding protocol (see Appendix H). The scale was designed to rate the documents for clarity, purpose, implementation and practicability of enforcement and also whether the documents gave further access for those who had been discriminated against. The levels of agreement were:

- 1=Strongly agree
- 2=Agree
- 3=Neutral (Neither agree nor disagree)
- 4=Disagree
- 5=Strongly disagree

For OFI, there were six questions. This section contained two paragraphs (112 words; the entire OFI has 859 words). The copy of OFI I gave to the coders had numbered lines to facilitate the coding. Coders 1 and 2 answered all six questions.

For SANPHE, the same two coders were used. SANPHE is a longer document as compared to OFI. It has 41,291 words and 91 pages. The official document is segmented into numbered paragraphs with titles and numbered sections with titles—there were thirty-five paragraphs, sections and sub-sections. Each paragraph, section and subsection addressed a specific item to redress past inequities and transform South Africa's higher education system. The coding protocol had thirty-five questions — one for each of the paragraph, section or subsection. The copy of SANPHE I gave to the coders had numbered lines to facilitate the coding. Coders 1 and 2 answered all thirty-five questions.

After the coders completed the coding, I met with each of them to get their comments and perspectives about OFI and SANPHE. Here are some excerpts of what they said:

Coder 1 stated:

- On OFI: It is too short and [it] lacks critical details. [It requires] something addressing how institutions would need to seek creative means to inform those groups who've been traditionally discriminated against—step-by-step procedures that could be carried out and monitored to address discontinuance of discrimination. It [OFI] is a perfunctory statement that has minimal relationship to the realities of discrimination problems throughout the State related to access to higher education.
- On SANPHE: It provides some good directions of expected changes with a time-specific plan that will assist institutes of higher education to meet those expectations.

Coder 2 stated:

- On OFI: For such an important public policy, it is very short — it lacked historical context of the issue of race relations.
- On SANPHE: It is an ambitious plan and too big. I have concerns about how they are going to accomplish the goal of increasing access. There are a lot of symbolic statements but the plan lacks substance beyond practical implementation. Other concerns are practicability and costs to implement.

*Intercoder Percentage Agreement:* Intercoder percentage agreement is the degree of agreement between the coders. The following tables summarize the OFI and SANPHE

coding results amongst both coders. The **# Questions Agreed Between Coders** show number of questions the coders selected the same rankings on the scale. Codes 1 and 2 (Strongly Agree and Agree, respectively) were grouped together and Codes 4 and 5 (Strongly Disagree and Disagree) were also grouped together. However, Code 3 (Neutral Agree nor Disagree) was not grouped with any other of the codes. The **# Questions Disagreed Between Coders** show the number of questions the coders selected different codes. Table 1 shows the results for OFI and Table 2 shows the results for SANPHE.

Table 1

# Questions Agreed Between Coders:	= 4
# Questions Disagreed Between Coders	= <u>2</u>
<u>Total (n)</u>	= 6
Percent Agreement = $\frac{4}{6} = .667$ (66.7% agreement)	

Table 2

# Questions Agreed Between Coders:	= 17
# Questions Disagreed Between Coders	= <u>18</u>
<u>Total (n)</u>	= 35
Percent Agreement = $\frac{17}{35} = .486$ (48.67% agreement)	

Tables 1 and 2 shows a 66.7% and 48.7% agreement respectively between the coders. Neuendorf (2002) noted several researchers have proposed that a 70% agreement to be considered reliable; however, the results above do not meet this criterion and there are several reasons for this. The percentage agreements showed in Tables 1 and 2 shed important light on the substance of and the clarity of the policies.

Both documents were politically motivated — OFI was an Executive Order — and there was an eagerness of purpose intended to rectify contentious affirmative action

issues. The coders rated the documents for clarity, purpose and implementation. As academic professionals, Coders 1 and 2 noted the lack of specific support to achieve the governing entity's intentions. For OFI, Coder 1 noted that the document lacked details and there should be "creative means to inform those groups who have been traditionally discriminated against." On the other hand, Coder 2 noted that "for such an important policy, it [OFI] is very short — it lacked the historical context of the issue of race relations."

For SANHPE, Coder 1 noted it "provides some good directions of expected changes." Coder 1 coded two items 3 (Neutral). Conversely, Coder 2 thought it [SANPHE] "lacks substance beyond practical implementation" and coded sixteen items with a Neutral rating because of his belief that the government could not achieve the goal or benchmark as stated. Coder 2 noted he was concerned about the practicability of enforcement, as the plan [SANPHE] was too ambitious and ideologically slanted.

The percent agreement between the coders showed that the policies' clarity was deliberately befuddled by the policy makers — this was noted by the coder's judgments on their point of view of the each of the policies. It appears that OFI and SANPHE's governing authorities believed they had a noble purpose and a clear mandate to address access to higher education. However, the policies obfuscate on purpose. Without specific clarity, and a funding mechanism, senior leaders at universities could face difficulties in successfully implementing the policy. While these policies were formal responses to political dilemmas, their clarity and funded financial support will be the essential keys to successful implementation.

### *Textural Summary*

The purpose of this section is to summarize the essence and the salient points of each interview. All the participants responded to all of the interview questions and no one expressed any reluctance to answer any of the questions. Here is a textural summary of each interview.

President of a university in Florida. In conversation (see Appendix I for selected excerpts of this interview) with the president about how he saw his role at his university, he said:

I think that the position as president at this university is certainly a position that provides a great deal of opportunity to give leadership to the development of this university and higher education in general in Florida.

He noted he found his time at the university was “a very enjoyable period.”

On his views of what effective leadership meant to him, he responded:

I think it is [where] you try to determine what goals and potential of the institution are in which you are leading by eliciting that really from the facts available and from the views of those of whom you are working. And getting a coalescing of the leadership in the various constituencies with whom you work to agree upon those goals and work toward them — and getting those who need to implement it, to get it done.

He described his style of leadership as:

[It is] one in which it is very important to have substantial involvement of all the people that are engaged in the process. I exercise participatory leadership and I’m a decision-maker having no qualms about making hard decisions — making decisions in a short period of time. I think I am a good listener. I like to gather people together to look at a problem, have a discussion of it and make a decision about how to go.

When asked what access to higher education meant to him, he responded:

[It] is to be given the tools in the pre-collegiate education to enable you to be admitted, to enable you to take advantage of the opportunities that are presented in higher education. So, a good education preparatory to higher education is seen as required for access.

In discussing the extent of his discretion to broaden access he said:

We are very selective — so access, in the first instance has to be — it requires a high level of pre-college attainment — in terms of grades, test scores and of the other indices which we use and which are focused primarily on academic qualifications. But we also take into account economic, socio-economic considerations.

Furthermore, he noted:

Before OFI, this university was engaged I think very thoughtfully in affirmative action. Affirmative action has been tarred by a lot of people by assuming it is something that it isn't. With the implementation of OFI, the ability to use the tools of affirmative action as have been generally understood and used was no longer available. So we had to develop other means of accomplishing as much in terms of access for those not within the prior mainstream and for those traditionally discriminated against as best we could.

In describing what his university did, he said:

The general method we have used is what I call holistic admission policies — taking into account a whole range of criteria but still weighing the academic qualifications very highly. We can't look specifically at race, ethnicity or religion along with a lot of other things, age and so forth. But we look at economic backgrounds, we look at places of residency, and we look at particular high schools where there has been a low rate of attendance in colleges and universities.

When asked about his point of view of the OFI, he responded:

*I opposed* [italics added] it when it was discussed and proposed by the Governor. *I opposed* [italics added] it when the Board of Regents adopted it. *I opposed* [italics added] it in the first place because it was bad public policy. I think affirmative action reasonably implemented a sound public policy. I believe to have a policy that says we are not going to have affirmative action but we are going to try to do things that would amount to the same things that would occur if we did use it is not the right way to go.

In terms of implementation of OFI and the challenges he faced, the president noted:

[It was] finding ways to modify the admission policy that would have enabled us to provide broader access without violating the principles of [the] One Florida.

On the issue of the value of diversity and its value to higher education, he stated:

[It] is to provide access to people who haven't had it in the past — a kind of makeup. When you are being educated, the University takes on a very responsible and strong place in a multicultural and global society in which we live. You are much better educated if you are educated in an environment that is multicultural and global. So, to reduce the number of students from diverging ethnic groups, it reduces the quality of education for everyone involved. So, people are learning about other people who live next to them, a little away from them and across the world.

In his final remarks about broadening access to higher education at his university, the president stated:

I feel that it is extremely important and I wish we had not been proscribed from doing the things we were in the past. [We have] an evaluation every year and every semester as to how things worked that year. What of the new things we tried — worked; What are the new things we tried — didn't work. How can we modify what we are doing in order to make it better? That's something I don't get deeply involved in because I have generated a process in which that occurs with the kind of people who want to make it work and how best to make it work.

In sum, the president's perspectives provided a passionate look with a breadth of data that is compelling on his views to broaden access to higher education and implement OFI.

Provost of a university in Florida. In conversation (see Appendix J for selected excerpts of this interview) with the provost about how he saw his role at his university in the context of admissions, he said:

*I believe strongly in access* [italics added]. And I believe philosophically that having a diverse student body is essential to the education process.

In terms of what access to higher education meant to him, he said:

Access previously meant — prior to the One Florida Initiative — an aggressive use of affirmative action to provide for a diversified student body. “[Prior to the OFI], all we looked at were the SATs [Scholastic Aptitude Test] and GPAs [Grade Point Average]. I just felt personally offended by that policy. [When] Governor Jeb Bush of Florida made a dramatic change in the use of affirmative action that really pushed me even more strongly to reexamine the way we were doing admission at this university.



On the issue of diversity, he stated:

Diversity in education means a more diverse student body representative of all segments of American society that in my way of thinking is the ideal for the world — to reflect a diversity of our society and that diversity ought to be in existence in our society.

Similarly, on the issue of affirmative action, he stated:

Affirmative action was an aggressive use of race to diversify our student body to overcome the legacy of segregation in particular to make sure that Black citizens and the children of Black citizens had access to this university.

When asked if there were any aspects of diversity and affirmative action he disagreed with, he responded:

Philosophically, I was always troubled by affirmative action in that it was the only way we could provide an integrated academic environment. Like many Americans, I think I felt we had to use some extraordinary measures to overcome the legacy of the past and like many Americans, I was willing to use affirmative action to try to counterbalance the legacy of segregation.

Furthermore, on the weaknesses of the usage of diversity and affirmative action, he said, “the weakness of affirmative action was that of course you ended up discriminating against somebody.”

On the extent of his discretion in implementing diversity and affirmative action programs, he stated:

Actually, the president and the provost have fairly wide discretionary powers within an institution to implement policies and procedures in these areas. Generally speaking, we wouldn't do it without significant discussion with groups of faculty and staff.

When asked about his view of OFI, he responded:

[It] was quite a challenge for us because we had been using affirmative action as was mentioned. We have been using race as a factor in our decision making process for admissions. It gave us certain comfort levels to diversify our student body.

In a follow-on question about the shortcomings of OFI, he said:

For us, what it forced us to do was to look seriously and substantively at our admission process. We had to go back to the drawing board and say, okay, there is a new policy in place that does not allow us to use race — What can we do in our admission policy to make it more equitable for everybody that applied? And so what we did was we put in place an admission policy that looked at the students' entire record to look at their response to essay questions.

When asked whether there was anything unique about him that guided him in broadening access to higher education, he responded:

I don't think there is anything unique about my style. I think my style, my philosophy is probably not terribly unique compared to other senior administrative officials around the country. Basically, I just believe that the American cultural fabric and the diversity of its population and its citizenry are something that is extraordinarily important. We have an obligation as an institution of higher education to see that access is provided to all those groups of citizens. I think in the classroom where students learn about half of what they learn from one another and the other half they learn from the faculty member. I think to have diversified views in which students are asking questions from different perspectives or offering answers from different perspectives — that that educational experience is fundamental to the educational process and the advancement of the educational learning experience of our students.

Lastly, in his final remarks, he stated:

We have a lot of conversations with our students about how to treat one another. So we've done a lot of things. Some of them are working well. We have to continue to reexamine them because I don't think we have got the solutions yet. Things have gotten a lot better here but we continue to believe we can improve a lot more. So that's where we are.

In sum, the provost's perspectives provided a coverage of data that exhibited his philosophical beliefs and his eagerness to broaden access to higher education and implement OFI.

Vice-Chancellor of the South African University. In conversation (see Appendix K for selected excerpts of this interview) with the vice-chancellor of the South African university on how he saw his role at his university, he said, he does not see his "role purely as an administrator." On the contrary, he believed he was there "*to lead* [italics

added] the university obviously with the assistance of the various senior colleagues and senior academics, etc.”

On leadership, he explained he practiced a “participatory management style” and has “a very open door policy.” He believed this enabled him to “lead by example,” however, he is “not afraid to make decisions when they got to be made.” To do this, he consulted with his colleagues and he believed there was “a very collegial style” within the university and he relies on this to lead.

Moreover, on effective leadership and what it meant to him, he said:

It means taking the University as a *quality* [italics added] institution in our present new context in South Africa along the lines of *quality* [italics added] teaching and *quality* [italics added] research and that’s where I see us leading this institution to become really a *quality* [italics added] international and African university.

Access to higher education was a major focus of this research. When asked what access to higher education meant to him, he responded:

We could just take White and Black students from an advantaged school background — I just don’t see that we should be doing that. We would be comfortable to do it but we have an obligation I believe as far as access is concerned to look for *potential* [italics added], particularly Black school leavers from rural schools who haven’t had the advantages but have huge *potential* [italics added].

Further on access, he noted his passion and strong feelings for this issue by saying:

It is leadership to show that taking these people is in fact in their interest because it may take a little bit longer but products I believe are going to be better. Because these are outstanding people who as I say have not had the opportunity having come from disadvantaged schools. Our approach is that we have differential entry, so we will take rural people from disadvantaged schools with lower paper qualifications than other people. And we have differential process that will take longer — we have a foundation year, mentorships, etc. to make quite sure that they succeed. The differential progress will take longer because of their background but absolutely critical, is equal exit. And you got to work at this because it would be very easy to have Black university graduates and White

University graduates — many universities do make an error as far as this is concerned.

The vice-chancellor reiterated his point later in the interview by stating, “those words — *differential entry, process, progress but equal exit are critically important*,” [italics added].

On the value to diversity to higher education, he said, “it makes you think.” He continued:

Not only does diversity force you to look at your methods of teaching and I believe improve them as a result, it also, broadens your approach to research and opens different areas of research — looking at problems in different ways.

Similarly, on the value of affirmative action to higher education, he said:

You got to remember that we came out of forty years of forced living apart. And unless you work at living together, it doesn’t happen. And it has only been ten years since the change of government. They [the apartheid government] went out of their way to deny access of Blacks to any type of education, particularly higher education that would make them succeed in the market place.

Now, he believed it was important to bring in people in his institution with potential but not lower the standards. Continuing on, he said:

I see it [affirmative action] as taking people from disadvantaged backgrounds who are as good as anybody else and giving them the opportunity to exit the university as good as anybody else. But if you don’t have an affirmative action policy to get them in, they will never be here.

Despite diversity and affirmation action programs, Black students are very sensitive to the issue of quality the vice-chancellor said. He continued:

The Black students here — because they have been denied access to top education — are very critical about not getting the top people to teach them and they don’t see color. So, you are doing them a disservice if you appoint less able people to those students to teach them. They are very bright, and they are very discerning.

SANPHE was crafted to redress past inequities in the country’s higher education system. On his point of view of this document, he said:

It is a very good document. There is little you can find wrong with it. If you read it, it is very realistic. It gives us a framework to ensure our policies within University fit in with the good of the plan. The philosophy of that document agrees with the philosophy here.

On the other hand, as the government tries to broaden access, the Vice-Chancellor believed that that will, “interfere[d] with autonomy [and] that they may want you to push things that are not feasible.” Moreover, he said:

I see the potential for conflict where particularly if you can get a person with a particular ideology that you would clash with their ideology with regard with what I believe our University should be doing.

On his relationship with policy makers in Pretoria, his nation’s capital, he believed it is important to have strong relationships. For example, he said, his academic credentials to include his research and teaching experiences are critical for the relationships. He continued:

The Minister knows when I talk about science, I’ve done it and he will listen. When I talk about teaching, I’ve done it. This excellence as far as I am concerned carries over in interacting with government officials and the Minister.

On the question about the value of higher education to his country, he responded:

Absolutely huge. Education is going to be absolutely critical in particularly higher education in this country. When we came out of the apartheid era we had a real lack of qualified people in all areas. Degreed people in this country have a huge opportunity — the country needs them. It is really urgent to produce high quality people.

Lastly, when asked what are some of the most urgent issues higher education institutions are facing and will face in the future in his country, he indicated several. They are: the need to make sure poor Blacks get a high quality secondary education, the immediate need to look at how the aging White academic population will affect the country and determine what needs to be done, the critical issue of funding higher education and the impact of government oversight on universities, need for more funding

for remedial and foundation courses for students with a poor secondary education foundation and the need to focus on quality in all educational institutions.

In sum, the vice-chancellor's perspectives provided a broad and a good range of substantive data and a deeper understanding of how he felt about broadening access to higher education to those who have been traditionally discriminated against.

Registrar of the South African University. In conversation (see Appendix L for selected excerpts of this interview) with the registrar he noted that access to higher education is a major challenge for senior university administrators in South Africa. The registrar sees effective leadership as:

Providing vision, guidance and setting the direction — not in an autocratic manner, trying to work much harder than anyone else and to take [the] responsibility for the strategic direction.

In verbalizing on the role of higher education to his country, he said:

It is essential. [This] is a developing country and although there is a massive unemployment problem in the country, at the other end of the scale, there is a huge shortage of higher-level skills and training. That's the market we are in — we are in to fill the gap or at least make the attempts to do so.

The registrar noted the issue of access is a problem. More specifically, he said:

It is a problem in South Africa because of the history of apartheid. Apartheid has done this country a massive disservice obviously — particularly in the area of education — where we are left with a legacy of a whole lot of really *atrocious* [italics added] schools — I mean they are *disastrous* [italics added].

In terms of broadening access to those students who have been disadvantaged, he said:

We would look at what the student has done and if in a bad schooling situation, that student has been one of the stars in that bad situation, we would consider that person. We have to go looking for potential rather than achievement. So, admission in South Africa's higher education is a really difficult thing. There is no easy way of doing it and very often we get it wrong. And we are very conscious of the difficulties that arise when we do get it wrong.

On diversity and its relevance in the higher education context, he said:

[Diversity] would be broadening of understanding of having to understand someone who comes from a very, very difficult situation and learning to not just cope but to welcome [it] and to see it as an *enriching experience* [italics added].

Furthermore, he noted, “Obviously, tolerance. Being able to cope with diversity and not reduce everything to my own prejudices.”

Likewise on affirmative action in the higher education context, he said:

I have very mixed feelings about affirmative action. On one hand, it is clearly necessary in South Africa. It is the only way we’ve been able to address previous imbalances of power, of privilege, and just access to all sorts of things. So, from that point-of-view, I have no difficulty with it.

In addition, he said:

In the University context, affirmative action is easy on the administrative side, but it is proving very, very difficult for us on the academic side where Black people achieve well in higher education, obtain higher degrees and so on — and, they are swallowed up by the commerce and industry.

On his view of SANPHE, he said:

I think it is a good one [plan]. I’m just nervous that they [Ministry of Education] are just moving too fast. If we look at what we have done the past few years, we actually achieved an incredible amount. The restructuring of higher education [in South Africa] in terms of size and shape of the landscape is profound.

On whether SANPHE will address past inequities, he said:

I think the answer is yes. The basic political problem is that the apartheid government created a whole lot of universities. Black universities, in the sense they were created solely for Black students and they were placed in what were called the homelands — they were placed in all the wrong places — where there was no urban base — *just nothing* [italics added].

When asked about the advantages of SANPHE, he commented:

I think the advantages are that the real needs of the country are being addressed. There is a massive drive towards equality. For the first time probably ever there is a strong drive towards quality in the whole system.

In terms of implementation of SANPHE, he said:

It means far more meetings than before because I could have said yes or no to something. Now, I have to consult with a whole bunch of people and the outcome is the same as it used to be but the way of getting there is much more torturous than it used to be.”

Also, he said:

[It requires] involving more people in the decision making so they are aware of where we are going and why we are doing it. Now, we are really seeing [*sic*] what they are doing and that they are being more prescriptive than the government has ever been.

In terms of increasing access to higher education, the registrar stated:

[You] have to be as proactive as possible in this situation to ensure we are not getting into a reactive mode and always be in a kind of step behind. A lot of the things that are happening already are positive. We really do want to broaden the base of participation in the South African economy of people who have been previously excluded. And so it is really important as to how we can actually do that. So it is that kind of thing — looking for ways to be creative and proactive in these sorts of situations. That for me would be the biggest challenge.

Lastly, when asked what are some of the most urgent issues higher education institutions are facing and will face in the future in his country, he indicated some. They are: increasing demands and control by the national government, urgent need to upgrade poor Black secondary schools, focusing on quality in all educational institutions and the need for increased support programs for university students coming from disadvantaged schools.

In sum, the registrar’s perspectives provided a comprehensive and sweeping account of data that portrayed how he felt about broadening access to higher education, Senior official in South Africa’s Ministry of Education. The official — a director — has responsibilities for higher education issues (see Appendix M for selected excerpts of this interview). On the importance of higher education for his country, he noted:



Higher education plays a very important role in contributing to developing the higher-level skills that will be required in the labor force and to undertake the research for our social and economic strategies.

On the issue of broadening access to higher education and what it means for his country, he stated:

The major problem for access for us is to address the problem that access in the past has been restricted. In a quantitative sense, access has changed. There are more Black students in the majority and the latest data show seventy percent are Black students but in the proportional sense, Black students continue to be underrepresented. Access clearly is a major issue for us in addressing what was the historical legacy of apartheid.

When asked what part diversity plays in higher education, he responded:

When the institutions opened up [after Mandela was elected President] — for White universities, diversity became an important challenge because they have not in the past accommodated or catered to Black students. So, there are enormous problems in institutional culture — to ensure that institutions are a welcoming home for Black students. Diversity in this sense is a major challenge in the higher education system. I don't think it is an issue that has been adequately addressed. It is a difficult issue to address.

Similarly, when asked what part affirmative action plays in higher education, he responded:

I suppose our major concern from an access point of view is that institutions must start representing the demographic realities of the society. We are opposed to quotas because we do not believe in quotas — they have become artificial constructs in that institutions are more than likely not able to meet because there are enormous difficulties in recruiting appropriately trained Black students to higher education because of problems in the school system.

On the genesis of SANPHE, he stated, “we inherited a higher education system that essentially had no planning and if there was, it was of a perverse sort.” He noted, SANPHE was developed to broaden access and also:

[To] indicate what our key priorities and parameters would be within which we would expect institutions to respond to. So, we needed to give them a clear framework for which institutions would start thinking in the long term in what they wanted to do.

When asked about his view of a senior university leader's role in implementing SANPHE, he said:

We don't control the institutions but there is a perception we do. But institutions are autonomous. The only power we have is the power of resources but it is a power in a limited sense. The critical power in higher education is at the institutional level. The problem that we face is the problem of over capacity. We have weak leadership in our education system — management of leadership is a critical challenge for us. A lot of our problems are that we don't have strong leadership echelons in our institutions to drive change agendas in institutions.

In terms of addressing access to higher education, the director stated:

I think redressing the past is a very complex process especially when you have a range of institutions that were developed by very different intentions by the old regime. There is one argument that says redress means that in effect you level the playing field — you take from the rich and give to the poor. We certainly don't see it in that fashion or we don't have the resources. We don't have the money to pump to level the playing field. That would be fine but we don't have the money to do it. But money is also not the problem. It is part of the problem — it is not only the problem. People have access, so it is changing.

In his final remarks, he stated:

Some of the problems we have are that some may be addressed at the local level but currently are not being addressed because parents are more focused on getting their kids out of the system rather than trying to address the problems in the system. I suppose in that sense we are becoming a more normal society.

In sum, the official's perspectives provided a penetrating and absorbing view and with a broad coverage of South Africa's Ministry of Education position in broadening access to higher education.

### *Textural Analysis*

The purpose of this section was to summarize the data analysis and present the dominant themes, recurring messages or inherent characteristics necessary to broaden access to higher education for those who have been traditionally discriminated against — while at the same time recognizing its limitations. However, first, I would like to explain

and summarize my thought processes in doing the analyses, as this is an important component of qualitative analysis. Further, I will cite those researchers' work that guided me through the process.

Essentially, the data analysis involved listening to the taped conversations several times and reading, reading and re-reading the typed transcripts over and over to understand the participants' worlds. This process got me close to the data. Indeed, it was a reflective process so as to find meaning of the data and to understand the participants' perspectives as this is critical in qualitative analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Charmaz, 2003, Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Eisner, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Kvale, 1996; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Merriam, 1998).

Reading the transcripts was more than trying to understand the participants' world and the breadth of the data — it was also trying to understand the verbal nuances and to grasp the gist, substance and significance of the participants' ideas and what they were saying (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Eisner, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Guba & Lincoln, 1981). Moreover, reading the words over and over enabled this researcher to construct and conceptualize recurring themes (Eisner, 1998). Eisner's (1998) model of data analysis was helpful. Its four components: description, interpretation, evaluation and thematics were used throughout the analysis processes to find meaning to the data (Eisner, 1998).

Likewise, naturalistic inquiry provided another tool to analyze the data (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). These researchers used a metaphor — an onion — to explain the advantages of naturalistic inquiry (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). They explained this process as:

Each layer provides a different perspective of reality, and none can be considered more “true” than any other. Phenomena do not converge into a single form, a single “truth,” but diverge into many forms, multiple “truths.” Moreover, the layers cannot be described or understood in terms of separate independent and dependent variables; rather, they are intricately interrelated to form a pattern of “truth.” It is these patterns that must be searched out, less for the sake of prediction and control than for the sake of *verstehen* [italics added] or understanding. (p. 57)

The process of constructing and conceptualizing themes was based on a thorough understanding of the data. This process is referred to as grounded theory (Charmaz, 2003; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This process is flexible and heuristic (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Essentially, data were sorted into concepts and categories for analysis — Strauss & Corbin (1990) defined a category as a “classification of concepts” (p. 61). This process commenced as the data was being collected.

The categorization of the data began using the knowledge from the literature review and complemented by the discerning details provided by the participants during the interviews. After categorization of the data from the transcripts, the analysis process entailed comparing data to data, concept to concept, and category to category (Charmaz, 2003). The utility of this process provided me with the ability to gain a deep and clear perspective of the data and see the recurring themes.

The process of reviewing, analyzing and comparing the concepts and categories enabled this researcher to lift out the essential structural elements of each category. The reading and rereading of the data continued and helped to shape, spark and strengthen my perceptions of each theme as they emerged.

In response to the questions, the participants’ enthusiasm and their willingness to share their conceptions of issues of access to higher education for those who have been traditionally discriminated against struck me. None of the participants expressed any

discomfort in answering any of the questions. It became clear very early in the interviews of each participant's honesty and the high moral tone of their respective conversation. I believed each was very comfortable to share their philosophical beliefs about what they saw were the essential mission and purpose of their university to right the wrongs of past social injustices. When an interview was completed and I reflected about what was said, I was amazed at the coverage and the breadth of the data.

I recognized early in the interviews the broad intellectual range, the relevance and the significance of what each participant was saying. My initial reaction to the interview was the extent of the intellectual scope of the interrelationships to existing research, theories and effective practices in higher education — to be discussed below.

Overall, the president of the university in Florida in response to the questions shared his thoughts in a very candid and straightforward manner — see Appendix I for selected excerpts of the interview.

First, he was opposed to the One Florida Initiative. Indeed, he was not silent about his opposition — he expressed them at official meetings and various public forums and to those who were critical in crafting and approving it. He noted, however, while he was opposed to OFI on philosophical grounds because “it was bad public policy,” he nevertheless felt it was important to find ways “to continue a strong program of access.” As the senior leader he has much discretion to interpret and implement internal university policy and he reached out within his institution and used outside consultants to find ways “to overcome the problems created by OFI.” Despite the limitations placed on his institution as a result of OFI, his leadership and philosophical beliefs and actions were

indeed critical in bringing his institution in compliance with OFI and “to continue a strong program of access.”

It is evident from the interview how his philosophical beliefs guided him in leading his university. Most important, for example, was how he saw his role — he saw himself as one in a position that is critical “to give leadership to the development of the university.” Further, he understood and accepted the critical role he must exercise and the purpose and mission of his university. More specifically for example, he saw diversity as a means “to provide access to people who haven’t had it in the past — a kind of makeup.” He recognized the importance of diversity and saw his institution as having the responsibility to create a “multicultural and global” society.

On the issue of access, he also had certain steadfast beliefs that guided him. For example, he noted access to higher education requires “a very high level of pre-college attainment.” He emphasized the importance of a solid secondary school education and its importance for taking “advantage of the opportunities that are presented in higher education.” This was a significant point in that the quality of a secondary school education “is seen as required for access.” Further, he gave emphasis to the importance of taking “into account socioeconomic considerations.” As a result, he supports “holistic admission policies...with a whole range of criteria,” but “still weighting the academic qualifications very highly.”

The president expressed his inner feelings and views on what he saw were the essential attributes of effective leadership. He exercised participatory leadership, not afraid to make “hard decisions” and through “various constituencies,” effective communication and listening, he found consensus “to determine the effective means” to

achieve the overall goal of his institution. Team effort — bringing “people together” was important “to look at a problem, have a discussion of it and then make a decision about how to go”— was important to him and is an attribute of his style. While he has discretion to shape his university’s policy decisions, he prefers instead to use teams, listen to other views and not act in an autocratic manner.

To close, this analysis of the president’s interview revealed how his philosophical beliefs and his actions guided him in leading his university after OFI was proposed and adopted.

The provost of Florida’s institution was very open in response to the questions — see Appendix J for selected excerpts of the interview.

The provost was perhaps a little cautious in responding to the question about his view of the One Florida Initiative. While he did not say he was opposed to OFI, he did say it “was quite a challenge” for his institution. He noted that the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision in June 2003 in the University of Michigan case did not have an impact on his university. He emphasized that although the Supreme Court stated race could be used as a factor in university admissions, the Governor of Florida said that was not permitted; thus, race is not being used as a factor at his institution.

In many respects, the provost’s philosophical beliefs in regard to access and leadership style are similar to his president as was discussed above. The provost noted at the start of the interview, how much of his early academic work has been on race relations and ethnicity. Some examples of his beliefs are now discussed.

On the issue of access, he has resolute philosophical beliefs. For example, he talked about the “legacy of segregation” and felt his institution had “to use some

extraordinary measures to overcome the legacy of the past” and “felt personally offended” by the policy to look at only SAT’s and GPA’s. He underscored the fact that his institution has an obligation “to see that access is provided to all” to explain the depth of his philosophical belief on providing access to those who had been discriminated against. One example he gave was the establishment of alliances with predominately minority high schools in order to enroll their students.

On leadership, certain attributes were evident. He discussed the importance to understand his university’s mission and to be personally involved in issues — always looking for other ways to make the admission process fair to all applicants. He noted they do this by listening and learning from other institutions in the U.S. that are implementing new admission rules. He recognized the importance of the socialization process in the reform of universities on why it is so important to listen and understand each other and how to resolve conflicts. Furthermore, he stressed the importance on why it is necessary to continue to reexamine how his institution can be made to be a friendly environment for all students.

On the issue of the extent of his discretion and what it meant, he acknowledged they have “fairly wide discretionary powers” but they would not make a decision without “significant discussion with groups of faculty and staff.” This was consistent with his president’s position and it’s an illustration of his participatory management style.

To conclude this analysis of the provost’s interview, it must be pointed out that his strong philosophical beliefs about the negative effects of segregation and the necessity to overcome the legacy of the past were inner forces that impact on his leadership’s decisions on access to higher education.



The university in South Africa Vice Chancellor's response to the questions was honest and frank, and insightful — see Appendix K for selected excerpts of the interview.

First his views on SANPHE. He believed it “is a very good document...it is realistic...there is nothing you can disagree with...and the philosophy of [it] agrees with the philosophy here.” This was an important point because as the senior leader, he now has the responsibility to implement the plan. With his agreement with the plan, its successful implementation was assured.

To understand his role at his university, it was necessary to look at his credentials. He is a distinguished teacher (received a teaching award at an American university) and a respected researcher and a top-rated scientist. These experiences have been an advantage not only at his university but also with his government oversight boards. He emphasized that when he speaks about science, his country's Minister of Education knows he's done it. And when he talks about teaching, the Minister knows he's done it. The vice-chancellor stated his experiences are also essential in working with his senior university colleagues and senior academics.

The issue of access was important for the vice chancellor. I could tell this from the interview. His views on this subject were sincere and give a broad insight of the challenges he faces at his university but also what other vice chancellors in South Africa are facing as well.

Apartheid was successful in its ideology — it successfully forced, with impunity, Blacks and Whites to live apart and successfully excluded Blacks from getting a higher education and created a culture of poor and inferior schools for Blacks. The vice chancellor understood this and he expressed what he was doing to correct the ravages of

this political ideology. His university has programs to enlist Black students with potential from disadvantaged schools and to have support programs (e.g. mentorships, remedial courses) to succeed in their academic career. The vice chancellor calls this differential entry, but equal exit for all students at his university.

Access to higher education was an important issue for the vice chancellor. He spoke passionately how apartheid impacted his country and what was needed now to move forward so that access can be expanded and the urgency “to produce high quality people.” For the vice-chancellor, he saw access to higher education for all students, especially poor Black students from disadvantaged schools as critical for his country’s economic development.

As the leader of his university, he knew and understood the importance of his role to effect changes in terms of increasing access to those who have been discriminated against and implement SANPHE. He confirmed his university has made significant progress in increasing the number of Black African students — currently, thirty-six percent of the student population — relatively quickly and he intends on increasing that number. He acknowledged, however, that there were bumps along the road — “last three years were horrendous...uncertainty and ...instability was huge.”

On the issue of leadership, he stated he has “a very participatory style”— and he has “an open door policy...leads by example, and not afraid to make decisions when they got to be made.” He discussed the value of a collegial atmosphere, the importance of communication between himself and his staff and the significance of continuously trying to change his institution’s culture and climate so as to achieve the university’s mission.

He revealed his philosophical beliefs on diversity and affirmative action but noted there was some initial opposition. On diversity, he noted, “it makes you think...and [it] challenges everybody, and it is good.” Further, he noted, [diversity] “broadens your approach to research and opens different areas of research — looking at problems in different ways.” These different approaches he noted do lower standards.

Similarly, on affirmative action, he understands the importance to take people from disadvantaged backgrounds and give them the opportunity but he noted you have to work at it to make sure there are support programs for them to succeed. He was honest however, there are still some people who are “totally against affirmative action...but you got to lead them and convince them.” For the vice chancellor, this is a challenge.

The vice-chancellor’s tone during the interview was positive and upbeat. It is clear that his academic and professional credentials gave him the leverage to lead his university and interact with government officials. His success in the implementation of SANPHE and increased access to Black students are directly a result of his strong belief that apartheid has indeed caused significant harm to his country.

The university in South Africa Registrar’s response to the questions was honest and forthright — see Appendix L for selected excerpts of the interview.

On SANPHE, he believes it is a good [plan]. He understood the objective of SANPHE and, more specifically, the need to redress past inequity, but he believes in some respects that the plan was an intrusion in his university’s operations. For him, SANPHE represented more reporting to his national government and it increased his workload severely at his university. Also, he noted his academic colleagues have complained about the additional administrative load they must bear.

The registrar appeared to be a pragmatist. He acknowledged the damage that apartheid did to his country's education system. He was lucid in his interview about the poor quality of schools that Blacks have been relegated to and this was confirmed with his reference to some of the problems his country inherited from the apartheid ideology. For example, he emphasized — it [apartheid] was “a massive disservice...we are left with a legacy of a whole lot of really atrocious schools — I mean they are disastrous.” Now, he believes they “have the social responsibility” of correcting the past and have no doubt that the role of higher education to his country is essential and that his university “is making a fairly significant contribution to the country.”

On the issue of access, he noted his university has built up relationships with secondary schools to recruit Black students with potential — particularly [those] students who come from inferior and poor schools. He mentioned the “bridging courses” which is another description for “remedial courses” in order to help the students in their transition to the university and to make sure they succeed. He noted that his university has made significant headway in increasing the population of Black students.

The registrar saw effective leadership “as providing vision and setting the direction — not in an autocratic manner.” He emphasized it was important to lead by example, be a model for the staff and to work as hard as everyone else. Also, he stressed the importance of communication and the need to constantly learn about new ideas and the need to apply those ideas at work.

The registrar's views on diversity are consistent with his vice-chancellor. He emphasized his university has increased the number of Black students to almost fifty-one percent of student population. On the other hand, he noted the value of diversity to

strengthen tolerance between the students, broadening a student's educational experience and make it an "enriching" one.

His views on affirmative action on the other hand are interesting. He was indeed honest in his views and noted he has "mixed feelings about affirmative action." He expressed his concern about some people being promoted without the required experience and that they are "totally unprepared" for the position. In spite of this however, he still emphasized he accepts affirmative action and he is supportive of it.

On his university's relationship with his national government, he was somewhat critical about it. He saw the relationship as not smooth. There was more of an encroachment into his university's operations as a result of new demands for information. Moreover, he saw the government as "being more prescriptive" than ever. He offered some examples to support what he meant.

His country's Minister of Education proposed a Central Admission Office for Higher Education for the government officials to decide who will go to a university (Rossouw, 2003). The minister based this on a model used in Ireland where he lived and worked for a long period of time. It was obvious the registrar did not agree with this proposal. He stressed that the proposed Central Admission Office would essentially take away all the years of hard work to establish relationships with poor Black schools, take away the "personal touch" they give to the admission process and most important, the model imposed was not a good fit for South Africa. For the registrar, he saw this idea as "unworkable."

Other examples of his government's Ministry of Education actions that he disagreed with are: the merging of universities — good ones with some bad ones — and

this has directly affected his institution, directing “what we can teach and where we can teach,” and a funding formula that impacts admission criteria and research.

Lastly, the registrar spoke with self-satisfaction of their accomplishments that in spite of all the difficulties, they have increased the number of Black students significantly, academic standards have not diminished and his university is viewed as the “best in the country.”

This interview with the senior official within South Africa’s Ministry of Education was beneficial and essential to understand policy-making and the relationships between the Ministry of Education and higher education institutions in South Africa — see Appendix M for selected excerpts of the interview.

The official articulated his perceptions of the relationships between the Ministry of Education and higher education institutions and the major educational problems in his country.

First, on SANPHE, he emphasized it was essential for the country to clearly increase access to higher education for Blacks who are the majority in the country and who have been discriminated against. Also, he noted the plan was to give the higher education institutions “a clear framework” to plan on redressing past inequities in the system and to change an organizational culture that discriminated against the majority of the population.

The official’s comments were most revealing about the effects of SANPHE. He noted that there was a price to pay for the legacy of apartheid and some institutions are no longer allowed to award certain doctoral and masters’ programs. Now, universities and technikons will be forced to reexamine the core mission and make sure that they are

consistent and in line with the country's "social and economic strategies." He described this as important in order to "develop the higher-level skills that will be required in the labor force."

The official spoke and stressed often the legacy of apartheid and the importance of bringing change into his country's higher education system. He hinted at some conflicts and discord within higher education institutions. Likewise, he was very candid about the reluctance of some traditional White institutions to fully comply with the government's goal to increase access. He noted that some institutions see government policies as an intrusion and people would "buy the plan [SANPHE] as long as it does not affect them."

The official gave a very cogent explanation of other major educational problems in the post-apartheid society as being "three strands" that have affected the educational situation in his country. The strands are (1) English-speaking groups; (2) Afrikaans-speaking groups and (3) Black Bantustans. He noted that these strands "continue to exist" and now the challenge for his government was to make sure that all institutions are "a welcoming home for Black students."

On the issue of diversity and the role it played in higher education, he explained that diversity is "a major challenge...and it is a difficult issue to address." He stressed that it was more difficult to change organizational cultures and that some "White institutions want their staff level to be White." Similarly, on affirmative action, he specifically stressed they "have not set quotas" at White institutions because they consider them [quotas] as "artificial constructs." He also confirmed the problems in the school system to produce quality students for entry to higher education. The two senior

university leaders I interviewed in South Africa also echoed this. Further, he emphasized the necessity for groundwork to assist poorly trained students with “foundation programs” to help them to succeed in their respective higher education program.

To sum up, this interviewee was indeed straightforward in depth and breadth of opposition to the Ministry of Education’s new initiatives to establish a “new order” in a post-apartheid society. He revealed the reluctance to fully comply and that process is a “stormy” and difficult one to fix the “deep underlying structural problems” in the country.

### *Comparing Florida and South Africa*

This section compares and contrasts the data between the individuals from Florida and South Africa. More specifically, it will discuss and analyze how these individuals addressed issues of access and their views on OFI and SANHPE.

Both policies had a specific purpose. In the case of OFI, it was intended to eliminate race as an admissions criterion in the state of Florida’s public university system. Essentially, the intent of SANPHE was to redress past inequities in South Africa’s higher education system. The purpose of OFI was designed to end the consideration of race as a factor to benefit a minority of a population, whereas, SANPHE was designed to increase access to a majority of a population. Education leaders became responsible to implement the plan.

In the case of Florida, the president at the university in Florida was opposed to OFI. Also, his provost thought it would be a challenge to implement OFI and his philosophical beliefs were opposite with it. On the other hand, in South Africa, the vice-chancellor I interviewed agreed with SANPHE. He believed it was a good plan to solve



discriminatory practices in the country's higher education system. The significant point here is that in South Africa, the leader agreed with the plan he had to implement; whereas, in Florida, the leader opposed a plan he had to implement.

At both universities, senior leaders do have wide discretionary powers to implement policies and procedures. The senior leaders I interviewed emphasized the importance of their leadership role, but they do not act in an autocratic way. In fact, both stated they have a participatory style of management and they seek out their colleagues to discuss issues before making a decision. This is an important point because the president was opposed to OFI, but nevertheless he did not exercise his discretionary power but rather sought ways to implement the intent of the law while at the same time relying on his philosophical beliefs to guide him. The president of Florida described on several occasions the importance of engaging others in the decision making process.

In their decision making process, all the leaders (including the provost and the registrar) had similar philosophical beliefs in regard to leadership. Their philosophical beliefs seem to guide them in making decisions. In South Africa, leaders understood the legacy of apartheid and knew what had to be done to increase access. They forged alliances and partnerships with disadvantaged schools without the direction of their Ministry of Education — using their university's financial resources to accomplish this. Likewise, both leaders in Florida did that as well without guidance or direction from the Governor's Office. They initiated partnerships with several traditionally Black high schools around the state of Florida and used their University financial resources to pay for the expenses. In Florida and South Africa, the leaders' philosophical beliefs,

leadership style and understanding of social issues that affect their communities guided them in implementing their respective policy.

The issue of quality of secondary education is a major concern for the four leaders that I interviewed. In terms of impact on their institution, they all described that it was important for them to have programs to help their new students succeed in their respective institution. The official in the South African University noted that his government would fund “foundation courses” to help ill-prepared students get the necessary background knowledge to succeed in the university.

In South Africa, the education official’s perception of university leaders was intriguing. He stated there was “weak leadership” in the universities and there is a need for “strong leadership” to drive the government change agendas. On the other hand, the leaders in the South African universities I interviewed felt that there was too much government intrusion into their affairs and they should be left to manage their own institutions. The lack of a strong bond or trust could cause conflict in the relationship however; the vice-chancellor’s credentials are essential ingredients to maintain a cordial link between his university and the Ministry of Education. One example of potential conflict is the Minister’s decision to implement a Central Admissions Office (Rossouw, 2003). The university’s leaders opposed this and saw it as an intrusion into how they manage their institution but the senior education official stated this was not an intrusion but only a way to make sure that institutions comply with the new postapartheid laws (Rossouw, 2003). While the Ministry of Education has a vision for the country, it was essential there was a “buy-in” at the university level. At the university I visited, the leaders have “bought-in” to the government’s vision to increase access as they understand

what apartheid did to their country but they believe increasing government oversight and control will diminish their institution's autonomy.

In conclusion, the universities in Florida and South Africa, while thousands of miles apart, do have some commonalities and differences. Their leaders have strong philosophical beliefs about their profession, what was needed to solve social issues, and they were fully committed to engage others in a team effort to increase access to higher education and make their institutions into a caring place, despite their stance on OFI and SANPHE.

The next section discusses the themes, which emerged across the data.

### *Themes and Making Sense of Them*

This section discusses the themes and making sense of them. The purpose of this study was to look at the assumptions and political processes that contributed to the establishment of OFI and SANPHE and to analyze how senior leaders implemented the policies.

The purpose here is to make sense of the themes. These themes were in essence recurring messages embedded in the interviews that were identified during analysis (Eisner, 1998). Essentially, the themes emerged in two distinct ways. First, they were conceptualized independently from each of the interviews and secondly, they were conceptualized by comparing interviews with each interviewee.

The themes are categorized into three categories — access, leadership and policy. These categories were selected because they represent what the data analysis represents. Each category is addressed separately in order to describe the themes and show how the data supported its classification. It must be assumed that all the participants answered the

questions and stated what they believed was necessary to accomplish certain tasks. They spoke frankly about what were the inherent characteristics necessary to accomplish those tasks. The themes are discussed below.

*Access.* Within this category, several distinct themes appeared across the interviews. In response to the questions, the interviewees described the issues of “ups and downs,” opportunities, challenges and demands they faced to broaden access. In reacting to the challenges, the leaders relied strongly on their philosophical beliefs and their style of leadership to implement the policy. In response to the questions about access and what they do to increase it for students who have experienced discriminations, it became evident from the data that the participants shared recurring messages between them. Those themes are:

- Driven and guided by philosophical beliefs to institute change — all four of the senior university leaders described and argued how their philosophical beliefs impacted on their decisions to increase access. For example, the president in Florida stated that while he was opposed to OFI, he nevertheless stated it was important to find ways to modify his university’s admissions policy without violating the principles of OFI. Similarly, the provost at this university, stated that having a diverse student body was essential to the education process. In South Africa, however, the vice-chancellor expressed SANPHE was a very good document and that it was important to go to disadvantaged schools, find Black students with potential and help them to apply for admission to his university. However, the registrar at the South African institution saw SANPHE as an intrusion to managing his university.

He nevertheless expressed that it was important to look for ways to be creative to broaden access to non-White and especially Black students.

- Need to comprehend the root cause for social inequities and take the appropriate action to redress historical imbalances among minority (especially Black) students' enrollment in higher education — all the interviewees unanimously asserted that there was a definite urgency to help those who were poor and who came from disadvantaged schools. The president and the provost in Florida stated that it was important to take into account socio-economic considerations in broadening access to their institution. In a like manner, both leaders in South Africa stated that it was critical to find Black students with potential to attend their universities. Because of his concern about the social inequalities in his country's secondary school system, the vice-chancellor insisted that the words "*differential entry, process, progress but equal exit*" were critically important to him and his university.
- Understand the social responsibility to build partnerships with disadvantaged secondary schools — it was explicit from the data that each interviewee placed much emphasis on establishing partnerships with other schools in an effort to broaden access. Both leaders at the university in Florida eagerly described the steps they took to attract students from predominately minority schools throughout their state. They also stated they had an obligation as the senior administrator of an institution of higher education to see that access was provided to all groups of citizens in their state. For the South African leaders, the social responsibility to build partnerships was expressed and

elaborated several times during the interviews. They stated that they could not reach those students who have the potential to succeed without the partnerships.

- Responsibility of those in leadership positions to take the initiative to implement holistic admission processes — across the interviews there was a pervasive argument to broaden access. All the interviewees expressed that it was important to consider not only the students' grades but to also take into account a range of criteria to include socio-economic backgrounds, potential, places of residency and focus on schools that have a historically low rate of attendance in colleges and universities.
- The benefit of a diverse student body to a student's education — in response to the question about what part diversity play in higher education, all the interviewees agreed it was critical. They noted that there was a benefit if one were to be educated in an environment that was more multicultural. Also, they noted a diverse classroom broadens the perspective of each student and it enriches the discussion between students.
- Take a lead role in their institution's response to increase access — in response to several questions about what they have done or were doing to broaden access, the interviewees answered that they had an important leadership role to play at their university and taking a lead role was imperative. This concept of taking a lead role emerged as the interviewees described the importance of their university's societal role, the need to abide with the law, the urgency to help to those who have been discriminated

against and the necessity to implement ideas that are perceived to be fair within their institution.

All the leaders unanimously expressed the above six themes to increase access in one form or another during the interviews. Their steadfast philosophical beliefs to correct the legacy of discrimination were a guiding force in developing strong access programs in the institution. They all stated it was important to help students from disadvantaged schools because of the benefits to the public.

It was quite clear that these leaders' personal beliefs influenced their decision making process. For example, they expressed it was important to build partnerships with secondary schools to reach out to poor students with potential and to establish holistic admission procedures to review a student's entire record. In addition, they emphasized the value of a diverse student body to a quality education. For the leaders in Florida and South Africa, increasing access was paramount.

This category, access, with its six themes represents essential elements and inherent characteristics to increase opportunities in higher education for those who have been traditionally discriminated against. The data analysis across all those interviewed showed this.

The next category, leadership, and its themes are discussed.

*Leadership.* Six themes relating to leadership emerged across the data. In response to the questions about leadership, the interviewees described their style and suggested the characteristics to be effective in their organizations. The interviewees' perspectives on leadership and the demands they faced showed the challenges arising out of their respective leadership position. The six themes are:

- The need for strong philosophical beliefs about their organization's mission and purpose — each interviewee expressed their beliefs about their institution's importance to society. The president of the university in Florida stated there was an expectation for him as a leader to broaden access. The provost at this university also had strong convictions on the importance of higher education to those who have been discriminated against. While pragmatic at times, he nevertheless expressed the need to enact procedural changes to ensure that access was broadened. The vice-chancellor and his registrar at the South African university also expressed that access needed to be extended to the non-White population in order to transform their country.
- Leadership is about having the right credentials (academic and working) to be effective — all the interviewees were highly accomplished in their fields and they essentially argued that to be effective one must have the appropriate credentials. Across the data, it was clear that the interviewees' conception of leadership was that credentials were important to avoid conflicts in organization.
- Effective leaders need to exercise a participatory style of leadership and to engage others to be effective. All the leaders expressed the importance to be democratic. They elaborated with examples of how they engaged others and expressed why they believed it was important to work with others in a collegial manner in order to increase access for minority students.
- Requirement to understand the mission of one's organization — it was clear from the interviews that each interviewee provided a clear explanation on the



importance of the role of their institution and the purpose of education. The leaders in Florida and South Africa described the legacy of discrimination and the need to expand access to those who have been traditionally discriminated against.

- The importance to be an effective listener and respect other peoples' point of view — there was a realization among the interviewees that one must listen to what others have to say and respect other peoples' point of view. All the interviewees noted that listening was an essential component of leadership and that it strengthens trust and relationships between people.
- Effective leadership comes from the ability to understand team dynamics and apply it within the organization. There was a recognition that the leaders understood they need the support of others to implement a policy and expressed the value to nurture relationships as a starting point to build teams.

The interviewees expressed fairly consistent views about their leadership styles. The common message was that in their position, it was important to have someone who was efficacious, decisive, and had the insight and flexibility to incorporate new ideas to lead. Also expressed was the value of having the proper academic and working experiences.

It was clear from the data that leadership was not an administrative function but a characteristic that encompassed philosophical beliefs plus actions to accomplish their institution's mission. Understanding their organization's mission was viewed as critical.

Philosophical beliefs appear to be an important criterion for all the interviewees. As senior leaders in their organization, they expressed frequently their sincere caring for

their organization, their passion for their positions, and why it was important to do what was necessary for the public good. The leaders' awareness of societal problems and their root causes influence their philosophical beliefs and help them to lead their institution.

These individuals saw themselves as the key person in the organization who was responsible for leading and making tough and difficult decisions. Both of the senior leaders at each university said they practiced a participatory style of management. They explained that getting the most knowledgeable individuals to be involved in the decision making process in a collegial manner was critical to lead an organization. In a university environment this was important because without consulting with key individuals and getting consensus, one may not succeed.

The interviewees stated they have discretionary powers in their organization but choose not to exercise such powers. The primary reason for this was that they understood the extent of their authority and preferred instead to use a more collegial approach to consult with their staff. This is because they would much rather consult with their senior colleagues.

Seeking people with knowledge in the organization, respect for other people's views and understanding team dynamics are essential elements identified across all the leaders at both universities. The ability to listen to others was an attribute that was common among the leaders. They felt this was important to establish strong relationships with their colleagues.

The leadership category and its six recurring themes characterize what are necessary for the interviewees' in the current role as the leader in their organization. It is the leader who ultimately has to make the decision and the six themes show the

characteristics that guides the leader. The analysis showed that their effectiveness as a leader was dependent on the six themes.

The next category, policy, and its themes are discussed.

*Policy.* An analysis of the data from the interviews revealed two themes relating to policy implementation. The themes are:

- One's philosophical beliefs must be consistent with a policy's objective for effective implementation — all interviewees indicated that their personal beliefs about the legacy of discrimination and the need to bring about equity for minorities guided them to implement the policy. The president of the university in Florida stated he was opposed to OFI and he expressed that he had an obligation to help those who came from a lower socio-economic status and not to violate the intent of OFI. Conversely, the vice-chancellor of the South African university expressed his support for SANPHE and that it was important to take the initiative to help students from disadvantaged schools. The two other key leaders (provost and registrar) at the university in Florida and South Africa stated they were also guided by their own beliefs to increase the participation of those who have been denied access in the past. They expressed there was an urgent need to increase the participation of those who have been denied access in the past.
- Effective policy implementation associated with leaders taking an active role in the organization — the essence of the data showed that all the leaders believed it was important for them to take an active role. The words and phrases they used showed that there was a requirement to work with others in

their respective organization to achieve the objectives of the policy. All four leaders expressed the importance to work toward developing strong relationships with their colleagues to discuss and implement new ideas.

Policymaking is a political process and it often encompasses controversy. In the study, both OFI and SANPHE were political decisions — though different — to address the usage of race in university admissions and the issue of redress for past inequities, respectively. All four university leaders expressed their personal feelings about the policy and revealed certain common values when they discussed issues of implementation. These personal feelings are classified as their philosophical beliefs and they are significant factors that guide each leader in determining how he was going to implement the policy.

Each leader had strong personal beliefs about his respective policy. The president of the university in Florida strongly opposed OFI and his provost essentially did not agree with it as well. In South Africa, both leaders agreed with SANPHE. In terms of implementation, these beliefs came in to play. In Florida, while both leaders did not agree with OFI, they did not take any actions to undermine the intent of the policy. However, they sought ways to implement the policy without abandoning their philosophical beliefs about race, ethnicity and issues of access for those who have been discriminated against. On the other hand, in South Africa, the leaders took action to implement SANPHE and their actions were not dissimilar to their philosophical beliefs.

In each university, the decision on how to implement the respective policy was largely made by the senior leader. It was essentially what they believe and their style of leadership that guided them toward the policy implementation.

### *Conclusion*

The breadth of data presented in this chapter shows that there are some similarities and differences in implementing OFI and SANPHE. Of utmost importance are the leaders' philosophical beliefs and their decision not to use the broad discretionary powers but rather instead to find consensus with other senior leaders in their respective institution. Clearly, it appears that there are essential elements and inherent characteristics of what is required to increase access and the ways to achieve that.

The final chapter summarizes the findings, implications for future research and recommendations.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

#### *Introduction*

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the research findings and suggest areas for further research.

To recapitulate, the purpose of this research was to (1) examine the issues educational leaders face in implementing the One Florida Initiative (OFI) and the South African National Plan for Higher Education (SANPHE), and (2) describe the impact these policies have had on selected higher education institutions within both nations. More specifically, the research questions were:

- What were the assumptions and political processes that contributed to the establishment of OFI and SANPHE policies?
- How did the leadership at selected institutions implement OFI and SANPHE policies?

The One Florida Initiative was Executive Order 99-281, signed by Governor Jeb Bush of Florida on November 9, 1999. This Initiative barred the use of race as a factor in university admissions in State of Florida's public universities (Bush, 2000a). On the other hand, the South African Government issued its National Plan for Higher Education in February 2001 (National Plan, 2001). This Plan emphasized the importance of higher education to South Africa — post-apartheid — and called for increased access to those who have been discriminated against during the apartheid era.

This research used a qualitative analysis methodology that provided a method to collect and analyze data. The rationale for a qualitative approach was that the nature of the research questions determined the methodology. The research questions were essentially to understand the assumptions and processes for the establishment of educational policies and determine how senior leaders implemented the policies.

This paradigm allowed this researcher to inquire, evaluate and interpret data in order to extract the emergent data themes from the participants in this study. In order to obtain access to those interviewed and to those who conducted the content analysis for this research, I committed that the taped conversations and all their names would be held in strict confidence. I conducted the interviews on site — this allowed me to personally assess the institution's culture and get a “feel” of what the institution was like.

My trip to South Africa was a learning experience — I saw the effects of apartheid in terms of the country's distribution of wealth and observed the importance of higher education for creating the economic wealth of a new democratic nation. I witnessed a range of efforts that were intended to help those who were discriminated against.

Content analysis was used to determine what OFI and SANPHE meant in relation to access to higher education. To get a deeper understanding of these documents, latent content analysis — a characteristic of content analysis — was used. Two associate professors did the analysis in accordance with my instructions.

The interviews with senior leaders at a university in the state of Florida and in South Africa were conducted on site. The interviews enabled this researcher to get a greater understanding of what the leaders have faced in trying to broaden access to higher

education for minorities. Moreover, the interviews provided the data for this analysis. The participants were very honest, candid and discussed openly their philosophical beliefs about access to higher education and what should be done to increase opportunities to their institutions for minorities.

The next section discusses the findings of this study.

### *Findings*

The purpose of this section is to discuss the five findings of this study. These findings represent the leaders' perspectives to implement the One Florida Initiative and the South African National Plan for Higher Education. Also, the findings generate a clear understanding of the issues that the leaders faced. They represent the kinds of scenarios that arose from the leaders' experiences in implementing OFI and SANPHE. The findings are:

1. *Leaders must have steadfast philosophical beliefs about the need to broaden access for those who have been historically discriminated against.* This was a common characteristic across the data. All the leaders spoke of the challenges they faced and that it was important for them to broaden access to higher education for minority students. They also expressed their perspectives of the role of their respective institution to help those from disadvantaged schools and also from lower socio-economic backgrounds (Fulton & Ellwood, 1989). Their perspectives were the kind of scenarios that arise from the experiences of the leaders at the strategic level. There was a recognition that the individuals below the senior leader would have to implement the policy and with that come the challenges (Bargh, Boccock, Scott, & Smith, 2000; Gleick,



1987; Mossberg, 2001; Wagner, 1989). Education leaders have important roles in their institutions and their perspectives have significant implications within an organization (Bargh, Boccock, Scott, & Smith, 2000; Gleick, 1987; Mossberg, 2001; Wagner, 1989). The leaders' dominant role in their respective institution and their ability to apply their beliefs to initiate a strategy to broaden access seem to resonate with the points discussed by Bell (2001) and Rhodes (2001). The coders in the content analysis expressed concerns about implementation of OFI and SANPHE. Their concerns were also similar to those of the senior administrators at the universities who sought creative ways and practicability to implement the policies.

2. *Awareness of the value of affirmative action and diversity* to their institution. The senior leaders clearly saw the benefits of affirmative action and diversity not only to broaden access to minorities but also to provide a richer classroom experience for the students (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Brunner, 2000; Chatman & Smith, 2000; Drummond, 1994; Sax & Arrendondo, 1999). All the leaders expressed that diversity was an important attribute for them and it adds value to a student's education. This is also consistent to what other researchers noted about the value of affirmative action and diversity to minority students (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Brunner, 2000; Chatman & Smith, 2000; Drummond, 1994; Sax & Arrendondo, 1999). At each of the universities in Florida and South Africa, the leaders' usage of affirmative action and diversity within the limits of the law is part of their leadership approach and the strategy they used

to increase access to minority students (Eckel, 2001; Koorts, 2000; Lomofsky & Lazarus, 2001; Mossberg, 2001; Pogue 2000).

3. *Participatory style of leadership is a characteristic common to all the leaders* as they described how they responded to the challenges to implement their respective policies. It was clear that the leaders were aware of the importance of this style of leadership (Bell 2001; Burns, 1978; Drucker, 1999; Fullan, 1993; Knight & Trowler, 2001; Senge, 1990) to successfully lead their institution. The president and the vice-chancellor understood that at their level in their respective organizations, others (e.g., provost in Florida and registrar in South Africa) would be responsible to implement the policies. The recognition of this point is critical in order to engage their subordinates to implement the policy.
4. *Commitment to team dynamics* was a persuasive attribute that the leaders practiced in their day-to-day activities. There was a sense that they recognized the benefits of working as a team would strengthen their leadership role at their university (Drucker, 1999; Fullan, 1993; Knight & Trowler, 2001; Senge, 1990; Wagner, 1989). In addition, Bell (2001) and Rhodes (2001) noted that leaders have an important role to lead change and engaging others in the organization will result in building a successful team. The interviewees stated in many ways they were committed to this so as to assure the policy would be implemented.
5. *Exercise prudent discretion to implement a policy* seemed to be an attribute that resonated with all the interviewees. The exercise of discretion in

implementing a policy is an important concept (Downey, 1988; Knight & Trowler, 2001). However, the senior administrators noted they preferred not to use that discretion but rather engage others to participate in teams (Bell 200; Drucker, 1999; Fullan, 1993; Knight & Trowler, 2001; Senge, 1990; Wagner, 1989). They believed if they were to use their discretion to implement a policy, they would alienate their colleagues. They also noted that their participatory management style and the commitment to engage others in their organization help them to use their discretion to implement a policy with prudence.

#### *Summary: Major Outcomes*

The purpose of this section is to summarize the major outcomes of the study. The outcomes are the criteria that resonated across the data obtained from the leaders as they implemented their policy in order to increase access to higher education for those who have been discriminated against. The outcomes are:

- 1) Need for collegial relationship and collaborative atmosphere between policy makers and senior university leaders to implement a policy.
- 2) Must have resolute philosophical beliefs on the importance of access for disadvantaged secondary school students from lower socio-economic backgrounds for the public good.
- 3) Must understand the causes for social inequities in their community.
- 4) Must implement holistic admission procedures to evaluate new university applicants to better understand a student's background and potential.

- 5) Must understand the value of diversity to higher education and incorporate that value into their institution's policies and procedures.
- 6) Must build alliances between disadvantaged secondary schools and higher education institutions.
- 7) Must have a keen understanding of their institutions' mission and implement policies and procedures to achieve the mission.
- 8) Must have appropriate credentials (education and past working experience) to be effective.
- 9) Must exercise a participatory leadership style, understand team dynamics, respect other colleagues' views and act in a democratic manner.
- 10) Must not use discretionary power to make decisions but rather seek consensus from other senior colleagues.
- 11) Policy makers must provide sufficient funding to universities to implement policy.
- 12) Policy must have clarity and a sense of practicability of implementation for effectiveness.
- 13) Policy makers must have an ongoing dialogue to strengthen relationships with senior leaders at universities to maintain credibility, integrity and effectiveness.

*Implications — A Leadership Effectiveness Model — A Proposition*

During this study, it became apparent following the data analysis that there was an overarching *modus operandi* that appeared across the data from interviewee-to-interviewee. Each interviewee had his own style but the similarities that existed across

the interviewees suggest that leadership characteristics could be connected to construct a model to determine leadership effectiveness. I call this phenomenon the *Belief/Action Leadership Effectiveness Model* and this appeared to be grounded in the interview data. This is described in the next few paragraphs.

The *Belief/Action Leadership Effectiveness Model* essentially consists of two parts. First, *Belief* is the philosophical belief the leader has. The leader must have beliefs that are consistent with the institution's mission and strong views about how to rectify issues or problems that are present or unique in the organization.

Next, *Action* is what either he/she has done, must do or must have an understanding of what is required to accomplish the mission. In addition, he/she must practice a participatory style of management, have the ability to communicate information effectively, listen to other ideas, act in a democratic manner, understand team dynamics, use teams where practicable, and use their discretionary power with prudence.

Utmost in this model is that the leader must exercise compromise when philosophical beliefs come into conflict with policy makers. He/she must find effective ways to make a decision but still rely on philosophical beliefs to guide him/her and not alienate the major power bases in the organization.

Therefore, in order to determine whether one is an effective leader or could be an effective one, the *Belief/Action Leadership Effectiveness Model* requires that one examines the leader's philosophical beliefs and analyzes the actions taken to achieve the organization's mission. If the leader has beliefs that are consistent with the organization's mission and has accomplished the assigned tasks, the individual could be considered effective. On the other hand, one can also determine whether one could be an

effective leader by analyzing one's philosophical beliefs and past decisions in another organization.

The value of this model is that it can either be used to determine leadership effectiveness or to make a decision on whether or not to hire someone for an organization. Information about one's philosophical beliefs could be obtained by asking the candidate qualitative questions about his or her beliefs. Additionally, the individual should be asked to provide examples of past working experiences. The analysis of the individual's beliefs and working experiences should be obtained to be compared to other data obtained through triangulation with other sources. The value of this model is that it can be used in determining performance effectiveness and in making a recruiting decision on whether or not to hire someone for an organization.

The next section discusses suggestions for further research.

### *Recommendations for Further Research*

This research has provoked more questions for inquiry and it sets a platform to contribute toward other studies of access that are clearly not limited to Florida and South Africa but include other countries as well. What naturally follows would be to duplicate the study with more university leaders. It would also be useful to investigate further by doing an entire study in South Africa alone and another could be done in Florida including all the state's public universities.

Another recommendation would be to study the trend that has emerged at universities to establish partnerships with secondary schools — the purpose is to gather information about their institutions and how they recruit minority students. University's leaders see this as necessary to ensure a broader access to students who have been

traditionally excluded. This research might give further insight into the challenges university leaders are facing in this area. Additionally, this research could benefit education administrators and assist political leaders to establish specific programs in secondary schools to provide students accurate information about university admission criteria.

In both South Africa and Florida, political ideology was a factor in crafting the policies studied in this research. Continuing study in this area would be of great benefit to policy makers and university leaders. More specifically, the research should be conducted to understand how political ideology influences policy making and policy implementation.

As an emerging democratic nation, South Africa is facing and will continue to face major problems to broaden access for its non-White citizens. As a result, the need for continuing research in education issues would be of significant benefit to political, policy and education leaders.

It would be important to study how the aging White university faculty population affects a country's education system. Both leaders at the South African university expressed concern about this and that in the next five to ten years most of the country's White faculty will meet their retirement age. Because of low pay, the profession is not an attractive one to White graduates. In addition, Black graduates do not generally see the teaching profession as financially attractive. The vice-chancellor and his registrar expressed that their government needs to do more to encourage Black graduates to enter the academic profession.

Both South African administrators stated that Black students have low participation rates in the sciences and they generally do not pursue graduate studies. It seems important to examine the reasons for this trend in order to get further insight to develop more effective affirmative action programs to assist Black students to enroll in the sciences and pursue a graduate education as well.

A final area for further study would be to investigate further how the government is expanding its control in the country's higher education system. The vice-chancellor and the registrar expressed concern over the government's increasing intrusion over the management of their university. This point was noted by one of the coders in the content analysis of the SANPHE by commenting that there were a lot of symbolic statements in the plan and that the plan lacks substance for implementation.

#### *Final Implications on Access to Higher Education*

Access to higher education is a significant public policy subject-matter with considerable importance. Today, more than ever, the general population sees access to higher education as a critical pathway for entry into most careers that pay well. As the number of minorities in the population increase, the demand for access to higher education will increase by those who have been traditionally discriminated against. Because access is enmeshed with issues such as quality of secondary education, diversity, affirmative action and policy making, it will continue to be contentious. To succeed in increasing access, policy makers will have to review what substantive actions are needed to provide specific support to achieve a level of access that will be perceived as a public good along with fairness.



Those ethnic groups who have experienced discrimination in the past see access as an earned right for past government-sanctioned discriminatory practices. In Florida, Blacks see access as a right won through the civil rights movement in response to the lack of governmental actions and through the federal court systems, namely, the U.S. Supreme Court. Now, any attempt to reduce access or create barriers are seen by Blacks as a diminution of previously hard-fought gains and an effort to return to the earlier days of overt discrimination.

In South Africa, the non-White population since 1994 gained increased access in their country's higher education system. But issues such as inferior secondary education and poverty among Blacks serve as impediments to success in a university. These are systemic issues that will face Black and other non-White South Africans for many years to come. Additionally, the State of Florida and the South African government must take or use a "double-track" approach to target and upgrade its elementary and secondary school systems to improve the education quality and, at the same time, provide funding for support programs for Black university students to ensure success.

It appears from the genesis of OFI and SANPHE that policy makers believe there is absolute assurance that they are right for the path they have chosen to address issues of access. It also appears they believe they have a clear mandate to rectify important public policy issues with policies that may not be agreeable with those who have to implement them. While the policy makers' approach to address access was to serve many functions, the lack of each policy's clarity and specific information of financial resources for implementation would indeed impact the practicability of enforcement.

Policy makers expressed that there was a noble purpose to OFI and SANPHE; however, university leaders would have to continue to develop initiatives to find minority students with potential. University leaders in both Florida and South Africa are forced to establish alliances and partnerships with disadvantaged secondary schools to locate, mentor and provide information about their institutions to potential students.

The quality of secondary school must be improved and the appropriate level of funding and other support must be provided to those schools that are in such need. There is much discussion about the inadequate secondary education pipeline and its failure to educate students. The education pipeline has become a much-overused metaphor. If policy makers continue to use the education pipeline, then I believe we should determine what are the factors that determine whether a student will succeed or fail in the system. I propose a new term or label, *student viscosity index* to identify those students that need immediate help and attention for success in the pipeline. This index should measure those factors (e.g., quality of school, socio economic factors, standardized testing) so that education leaders divert their resources to make sure students do not drop out the pipeline but rather flow seamlessly into a higher education institution if they choose to apply for entry.

In terms of broadening access, the value of diversity should not be ignored. Diversity in the classroom is beneficial for a well-rounded education as it brings different ideas and perspectives to students. With the increased linkage of national economies through international trade, diversity in the classroom benefits all students. New ideas and perspectives enlighten each student's view of the world.

Affirmative action is a sensitive issue not only in Florida but in South Africa as well. Affirmative action is a program designed for people of groups that have faced overt and covert discrimination and it creates an avenue of access. It also gives those who have experienced discrimination in the past an opportunity to enter the mainstream of society. To abolish affirmative action programs completely is to essentially assume that the final stage of making up for the past is here and no more needs to be done. That assumption also says that there is no more official commitment for making up for the past.

The economic benefits of higher education must be emphasized. The more educated a society is, the more national wealth is created. Investing in education creates wealth and the society benefits. Therefore, in terms of policy making, there needs to be a more bipartisan approach to education policy making. Policy makers must set aside political ideologies (e.g., establishing a non-political advisory council to the governing authority) when crafting education policies and ensure that the financial resources are provided to those who must implement the policies. Without the financial support, policies will be ineffective and not serve their purpose.

The findings of this study highlighted new perspectives of leadership and the demands of leadership. I found that leadership is not a science and it is not static. Also, during my interviews, I developed an appreciation of the leaders' values and their philosophical beliefs about access to higher education. The study of leadership is unfinished and it will continue because there is more to be learned from others. It needs to be studied because there is irrefutable evidence that new ideas of leadership continue to emerge from active leaders. By studying leaders we can learn new perspectives on how to lead.

In closing, increased access to higher education is critical to a country's domestic and international interests. Increasing education opportunities increases wealth. The returns from education also resolve social problems and create a more tolerant society. While there are many principal agents in broadening access, consensus of objectives must be achieved in order to ensure that the process to obtain a university education is perceived as fair by everyone.

### *Study's Impact on the Researcher*

This research not only fulfilled my academic requirements but it also gave me an insight into myself. Through the qualitative interviews, I met leaders who work diligently to broaden access for those have been historically denied entry to universities. Likewise, I admired their efforts to establish partnerships with secondary schools to attract students with potential from lower socio-economic backgrounds.

Qualitative research requires a certain rigor of understanding of the published literature and the participant's world. My classroom instruction and assignments prepared me for my research. At first, I was ambivalent about pursuing a study that required interviewing individuals about what they do and how they feel about certain aspects of their jobs. However, throughout the process of data collection and analysis, I reflected on my own personal experiences. As a result, I believe my classroom training in qualitative and quantitative research enabled me to "get close to" and to understand my data.

In some ways, I was fortunate to interview individuals who were accomplished and highly respected in their fields. My participants had strong philosophical beliefs about affirmative action and its importance in admission criteria. Also, my participants

shared their personal values of diversity in the classroom and their insights into their leadership style. Essentially, the conversations gave me a deeper sense of the value of an education and why it is absolutely critical to enlighten students. And, in the case of South Africa, I am now more convinced that education will be the only route for sustained economic development and the further strengthening of tolerance and respect for all peoples in the country.

Access to higher education is an issue of concern to all peoples. My research reinforced my belief that access is essential to diffuse knowledge so that greater understanding between peoples can be established and strengthened. Higher education should be seen by policy makers as an investment to create more wealth for a nation and not as a perennial political issue when election comes.

John Dewey in *Democracy and Education* (1966) noted education should be viewed as a way to communicate ideas, hopes, expectations and standards in a society. The greatest impact of all of this study on me was the clarity and relevance of Dewey's ideas in today's world. I am more convinced than ever that education and education alone can create greater national wealth and more tolerance among people with different backgrounds. Hence, access to education must be broadened to those who have been historically excluded.

### *Conclusion*

Access to higher education is an issue with a high priority for senior administrators and policy makers. This study sets a platform to contribute toward other studies of this issue that is clearly not limited to Florida and South Africa but to other countries as well. It will remain such an issue for years to come. It will continue to be a

key leadership challenge because education is now more important than ever for economic access in a more technological and competitive market place not only in the United States, but in South Africa and in other countries as well.

I trust that this research can benefit senior leaders in higher education and policy makers responsible for crafting education policy. In addition, I trust that these perspectives will benefit those who are responsible for designing programs to increase access to higher education especially for those students who have had limited or no opportunities in higher education.

## APPENDIX A

### **Florida Governor's Executive Orders #99-281 - Executive Order Regarding Diversity - November 9, 1999**

#### **Executive Order 99-281**

**WHEREAS**, the Florida Constitution provides that all natural persons, female and male alike, are equal before the law and that no person shall be deprived of any right because of race or national origin; and

**WHEREAS**, Florida's government has a solemn obligation to respect and affirm these principles in its policies relating to employment, education and contracting; and

**WHEREAS**, the use of racial and gender set-asides, preferences and quotas is generally inconsistent with the obligation of government to treat all individuals as equals without respect to race or gender; and

**WHEREAS**, the use of racial and gender set-asides, preferences and quotas is considered divisive and unfair by the vast majority of Floridians, produces few, if any, long-term benefits for the intended beneficiaries, and is of questionable legality; and

**WHEREAS**, the laudable goal of increasing diversity in Florida's government and institutions of Higher Education, and in the allocation of state contracts, can and should be realized without the use of racial and gender set-asides, preferences and quotas; and

**WHEREAS**, the obligation of Florida's government to root out vestiges of discrimination can and should likewise be accomplished without resort to remedies involving the use of racial and gender set-asides, preferences and quotas.

**NOW, THEREFORE, I, JEB BUSH,** as the Governor of the State of Florida, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the State of Florida, do hereby promulgate the following executive order effective immediately:

### **Section 1: Non-Discrimination in Government Employment**

- a. It is the policy of my Administration to provide equal opportunity to all qualified Floridians, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, gender, creed, color or national origin, and to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity through a positive continuing program in each Executive Agency and the Office of the Governor. This policy of equal opportunity applies to every aspect of employment policy and practice in my Administration.
- b. It is the policy of my Administration to seek out employees for hiring, retention and promotion who are of the highest quality and ethical standards, and who reflect the full diversity of Florida's population.
- c. Unless otherwise affirmatively required by law or administrative rule, neither the Office of the Governor nor any Executive Agency may utilize racial or gender set-asides, preferences or quotas when making decisions regarding the hiring, retention or promotion of a state employee. Any law or administrative rule requiring or allowing the use of racial or gender set-asides, preferences or quotas in hiring, retention or promotion shall be brought to the attention of my General Counsel by any affected Executive Agency no later than December 31, 1999.

### **Section 2: Non-Discrimination in State Contracting**

- a. It is the policy of my Administration to provide equal state contracting opportunities to all qualified businesses, to prohibit discrimination in contracting because of race, gender, creed, color or national origin, and to promote the full realization of equal contracting opportunities through a positive, continuing program in each Executive Agency and the Office of the Governor. This policy of equal contracting opportunities applies to every aspect of contracting policy and practice in my Administration.
- b. Unless otherwise required by law or administrative rule, neither the Office of the Governor nor any Executive Agency may utilize racial or gender set-asides, preferences or quotas when making state contracting decisions. Any law or administrative rule requiring or allowing the use of racial or gender set-asides, preferences or quotas, or artificial, arbitrary goals in state contracting shall be brought to the attention of my General Counsel by any affected Executive Agency no later than December 31, 1999.



- c. The Department of Management Services and the Minority Business Advocacy and Assistance Office at the Department of Labor & Employment Security are hereby ordered to develop an implementation strategy for all other aspects of my Equity in Contracting Plan by January 31, 2000, and to present that plan to my Office of Policy and Budget for appropriate action.

### **Section 3: Non-Discrimination in Higher Education**

- a. It is the policy of my Administration to support equal educational opportunities for all qualified Floridians, to prohibit discrimination in education because of race, gender, creed,color or national origin, and to promote the full realization of equal educational opportunities throughout the State.
- b. I hereby request that the Board of Regents implement a policy prohibiting the use of racial or gender set-asides, preferences or quotas in admissions to all Florida institutions of Higher Education, effective immediately.
- c. The Office of Policy and Budget is hereby ordered to develop an implementation strategy for all other aspects of my Equity in Education Plan by December 31, 1999.

### **Section 4: No Legal Cause of Action**

Nothing in this Executive Order shall be construed to create a cause of action or any legal remedy not otherwise provided for by law.

**IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF**, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, the Capitol, this 9th day of November, 1999.

**Jeb Bush**

Governor

ATTEST:

/s/ **Katherine Harris**

Secretary of State

## **APPENDIX B**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF NATIONAL PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION MINISTRY OF EDUCATION FEBRUARY 2001**

#### **FOREWORD**

The victory over the apartheid state in 1994 set policy makers in all spheres of public life the mammoth task of overhauling the social, political, economic and cultural institutions of South Africa to bring them in line with the imperatives of a new democratic order. The vision for the transformation of the higher education system was articulated in Education White Paper 3: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education (1997). Central to this vision was the establishment of a single, national co-ordinated system, which would meet the learning needs of our citizens and the reconstruction and development needs of our society and economy.

This National Plan outlines the framework and mechanisms for implementing and realising the policy goals of the White Paper. It is far-reaching and visionary in its attempt to deal with the transformation of the higher education system as a whole. It is not aimed solely at addressing the crises in some parts of the system, although these must be overcome. It will impact on every institution, as the institutional landscape of higher

education is a product of the geo-political imagination of apartheid planners. As I indicated in my Call to Action in July 1999, “it is vital that the mission and location of higher education institutions be re-examined with reference to both the strategic plan for the sector, and the educational needs of local communities and the nation at large in the 21<sup>st</sup> century”. The National Plan therefore provides the strategic framework for re-engineering the higher education system for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The National Plan recognises the current strengths and weaknesses of the higher education system and is based on a developmental approach that is intended to guide institutions towards meeting the goals for the system as a whole. Its implementation will demand commitment and hard work from all constituencies. But most of all it will demand our creative energy. The people of our country deserve nothing less than a quality higher education system, which responds to the equity and development challenges that are critical to improving the quality of life of all our people.

There can be little doubt that the National Plan provides us with a unique opportunity, perhaps one that will not come readily our way again, to establish a higher education system that can meet the challenges and grasp the opportunities presented to us by the contemporary world. We must be able to produce graduates with high quality skills and competencies in all fields. We must be able to produce research that will build our economy and make us significant players on the global stage. We must be able to create a learning society that draws in people of all ages and from all walks of life and gives them the opportunity to advance, develop and enrich themselves, both intellectually and materially. Most importantly, higher education must make a lasting contribution towards building the future generations of critical black intellectuals and researchers.

The National Plan is my response to the advice provided, at my request, by the Council on Higher Education on the restructuring of the higher education system. I would like to thank the Council and all the other constituencies both in higher education and beyond, whose commitment to transforming the system has contributed to the development of the plan. The National Plan has also been discussed by my colleagues and carries the full and enthusiastic support and endorsement of the Cabinet.

**Professor Kader Asmal, MP**  
**Minister of Education**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This National Plan provides the framework and mechanisms for the restructuring of the higher education system to achieve the vision and goals for the transformation of the higher education system outlined in Education White Paper 3: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education (July 1997).
  - 1.1 It is the Ministry's response to the Council on Higher Education's Report, Towards a New Higher Education Landscape: Meeting the Equity, Quality and Social Development Imperatives of South Africa in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, which was released in June 2000.
2. The National Plan establishes indicative targets for the size and shape of the higher education system, including overall growth and participation rates, institutional and programme mixes and equity and efficiency goals. It also provides a framework and outlines the processes and mechanisms for the restructuring of the institutional landscape of the higher education system, as well as for the development of institutional three-year "rolling" plans.
3. The National Plan proposes that the participation rate in higher education should be increased from 15% to 20% in the long-term, i.e. ten to fifteen years, to address both the imperative for equity, as well as changing human resource and labour needs.
  - 3.1 In the short to medium-term, however, it would not be possible to increase the participation rate because of inadequate throughputs from the school system. The main focus over the next five years will therefore be on improving the efficiency of

the higher education system through increasing graduate outputs. The National Plan therefore establishes graduation rate benchmarks that institutions would have to meet.

3.2 The National Plan recognises that efficiency improvements are dependent on addressing the underlying factors that contribute to low graduation rates. The National Plan therefore proposes that academic development programmes should be funded as an integral component of a new funding formula and that the role and efficacy of the National Student Financial Aid Scheme needs to be reviewed.

3.3 The National Plan proposes that the participation rate should also be increased through recruiting workers, mature students, in particular women, and the disabled, as well recruiting students from the Southern African Development Community (SADC) countries as part of the SADC Protocol on Education.

4. The National Plan proposes to shift the balance in enrollments over the next five to ten years between the humanities, business and commerce and science, engineering and technology from the current ratio of 49%: 26%: 25% to 40%: 30%: 30% respectively.

4.1 Further adjustment to the ratio is not possible in the short to medium-term because of the low number of students leaving the school system with the required proficiency in mathematics.

4.2 The desirability of shifting the humanities total below 40% is debatable given the continued need for skills in education, law, private and public sector management, social services and arts.

4.3 The National Plan proposes that irrespective of the balance in enrollments, the key issue is to ensure that all graduates are equipped with the skills and competencies

necessary to function in modern society, in particular, computer literacy, information management, communication and analytical skills.

5. Although the demographic composition of the student body is changing and is beginning to reflect the composition of the population, equity of access still remains a problem, as black and women students are under-represented in business, commerce, science, engineering and technology programmes, as well as in postgraduate programmes in general.

- 5.1 Equity of access has also not been complemented by equity of outcomes, with black students accounting for a larger proportion of drop-out and failure rates than white students.

- 5.2 Institutions will be therefore expected to establish equity targets with the emphasis on the programmes in which black and women students are under-represented and to develop strategies to ensure equity of outcomes.

6. The staff composition of higher education has not changed in line with the changes in the student composition. Blacks and women remain under-represented in academic and professional positions, especially at senior levels.

- 6.1 Institutions will be therefore expected to develop employment equity plans with clear targets for rectifying race and gender inequities. The National Plan recognises the difficulties in the short to medium-term of achieving employment equity given the paucity of postgraduates and consequently, the small pool of potential recruits. It therefore encourages institutions to recruit black and women staff from the rest of the African Continent

7. The National Plan supports the view that to achieve the transformation goals of the White Paper, the higher education system must be differentiated and diverse.
- 7.1 The National Plan proposes to ensure diversity through mission and programme differentiation based on the type and range of qualifications offered.
- 7.2 The programme mix at each institution will be determined on the basis of its current programme profile, including the relevance of the profile to the institution's location and context and its responsiveness to regional and national priorities, in particular, Government's Human Resource Development Strategy, as well as the demonstrated capacity to add new programmes to the profile.
- 7.3 The National Plan proposes to continue to maintain, although in a loose form, the existing mission and programme differentiation between technikons and universities for at least the next five years, as it promotes the access goals and the human resource development priorities of the White Paper and Government's Human Resource Development Strategy.
- 7.4 The National Plan lifts the moratorium on the introduction of new distance education programmes in contact institutions, which was imposed by the Minister in February 2000. However, from 2002, new student places in existing and new distance education programmes, including programmes offered as part of public-private partnerships, will only be funded if the programmes have been approved as part of the institution's plans. Institutions will also have to seek approval for the introduction of distance education programmes for which State subsidies are not required.



- 7.5 Redress for historically black institutions will be linked to agreed missions and programme profiles, including developmental strategies to build capacity, in particular, administrative, management, governance and academic structures.
8. The National Plan proposes the establishment of a single dedicated distance education institution to address the opportunities presented by distance education for increasing access both locally and in the rest of Africa. It will also enable economies of scale and scope, thus ensuring that advantage is taken of the rapid changes in information and communications technology, which in investment terms would be beyond the scope of any one institution.
- 8.1 The single dedicated distance education institution will be established through the merger of the University of South Africa and Technikon South Africa and the incorporation of the distance education centre of Vista University into the merged institution. The Ministry will establish a Working Group to facilitate the merger, including the development of an implementation plan.
9. The National Plan proposes to introduce a separate component for research in the new funding formula in order to ensure greater accountability and the more efficient use of limited research resources.
- 9.1 Research will be funded through a separate formula based on research outputs, including, at a minimum, masters and doctoral graduates and research publications.
- 9.2 Earmarked funds will be allocated to build research capacity, including scholarships to promote postgraduate enrollments, which would contribute to building the potential pool of recruits for the academic labour market.

10. The National Plan proposes that the institutional landscape of higher education must be restructured to create new institutional and organisational forms to address the racial fragmentation of the system, as well as administrative, human and financial capacity constraints. This will be achieved through:

10.1 Institutional collaboration at the regional level in programme development, delivery and rationalisation, in particular, of small and costly programmes, which cannot be sustained across all the institutions.

10.2 Investigating the feasibility of a more rational arrangement for the consolidation of higher education provision through reducing, where appropriate, the number of institutions but not the number of delivery sites on a regional basis. An initial analysis of the available data suggests that the number of institutions can be reduced. The key issue is to determine the number and form that this should take.

10.3 The Ministry will establish a National Working Group to undertake the investigation based on the principles and goals for the transformation of higher education system, as outlined in the White Paper.

11. The following mergers are proposed to go ahead, as they are not dependent on the investigation. However, their implications would be taken into account in the investigation.

11.1 The Merger of Natal Technikon and ML Sultan Technikon, which has been agreed to in-principle by the Councils of Natal Technikon and ML Sultan Technikon.

11.2 The incorporation of the Qwa-Qwa branch of the University of the North into the University of the Free State based on a previous decision relating to administrative

difficulties in sustaining the linkage between the University of the North and its Qwa-Qwa branch.

- 11.3 The unbundling of Vista University and the incorporation of its constituent parts into the appropriate institutions within each region. This could await the outcome of the regional investigation.
12. The Ministry proposes to establish National Institutes for Higher Education in Mpumalanga and the Northern Cape in order to facilitate access to higher education. The National Institutes will be established largely on the basis of collaboration between the different institutions that currently offer higher education programmes in the two provinces.

## APPENDIX C

History of South Africa and Significant Events (Thompson, 2001, pp. X1x-xxiv).

Millennia B.C.	Hunter-gatherers, ancestors of the Khoisan (Khoikhoi) living in Southern Africa
1487	Portuguese expedition led by Bartholomeu Dias reaches Mossel Bay
1652	The Dutch East India Company establishes a post at the Cape of Good Hope
1834-38	Cape colonial slaves emancipated
1907-7	Britain gives parliamentary government to the former republics; only Whites enfranchised
1912	South African Native National Congress (NNC) founded; later becomes the African National Congress (ANC)
1948	The Afrikaner National Party wins the general election and begins its policy of apartheid
1952	The ANC and its allies launch a passive resistance campaign
1964	Nelson Mandela and others sentenced to life-imprisonment
1976-77	At least 575 people die in confrontations between Africans and police in Soweto and other townships
1990	Mandela and others released
1990-91	Race laws repealed
1994	The ANC wins the first non-racial election and Mandela sworn in as president (May 10) and forms a Government of National Unity
2001	National Plan for Higher Education—issued (February 2001)

## APPENDIX D

Some of the major Declarations and Conventions that enunciated the right to education are as follows:

- Convention Against Discrimination in Education (1962)
- United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (1963)
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966)
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966)
- Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (1967)
- Protocol Instituting a Conciliation and Good Offices Commission to be responsible for Seeking a Settlement of any Disputes which arise between States Parties to the Convention against Discrimination in Education (1968).
- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1969)
- International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid (1973)
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1976)

## APPENDIX E

### INFORMED CONSENT

Dear (Name of Participant),

I am a doctoral candidate at the University of North Florida in Jacksonville, Florida. In order to graduate, I must complete a research study for my dissertation. The subject of my dissertation research is "Access of Higher Education in Florida and South Africa: A Comparative Policy Analysis." I am interested in the crafting and implementation of educational policy.

I will be honored if you were to participate in my study so that I can learn about your views and opinions in this important and timely issue. I believe the finished product will be of value to policy makers, university administrators and educators.

Your participation in my study is completely voluntary and without compensation. Our conversations during the study will be tape-recorded, transcribed and quoted in the dissertation. Your name will not be used in any part of the study and all aspects of your interview will be kept confidential. The tape will be kept in my custody and secured at all times. You will of course be allowed to listen to it or review the transcript if you so desire. There are no foreseeable or considered risks or discomforts related to your participation. Your willingness to participate will be signified by your signature below.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 904-928-9242 or at [mkhan@unf.edu](mailto:mkhan@unf.edu) or my dissertation committee Chair, Dr. Charles Galloway, to answer any questions you may have. He can be reached at 904-620-2990 or at [cgallow@unf.edu](mailto:cgallow@unf.edu).

I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate and I have received a copy of this letter.

Participant \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Principal Researcher \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

---

Division of Sponsored Research and Training

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Marty Z. Khan  
Department of Counseling and Educational Leadership

VIA: Dr. Warren Hodge  
Department of Counseling and Educational Leadership

FROM: James L. Collom, Institutional Review Board

DATE: August 6, 2003

RE: Review by the Institutional Review Board #03-106  
"Access to Higher Education in Florida and South Africa: A Comparative  
Policy Analysis"

---

This is to advise you that your project "Access to Higher Education in Florida and South Africa: A Comparative Policy Analysis", has been reviewed on behalf of the IRB and has been declared exempt from further IRB review.

This approval applies to your project in the form and content as submitted to the IRB for review. Any variations or modifications to the approved protocol and/or informed consent forms as they relate to dealing with human subjects must be cleared with the IRB prior to implementing such changes.

If you have any questions or problems regarding your project or any other IRB issues, please contact this office at 620-2498.

sah

Attachments

c: Dr. Kenneth Wilburn

## APPENDIX G: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS PROTOCOL

Section One — Used to interview university administrators who have the responsibility to implement either the One Florida Initiative (OFI) or the South African National Plan for Higher Education (SANPHE).

1. How do you view your role as the senior university leader?
2. What does effective leadership mean to you?
3. What does access to higher education mean to you?
  - What is the extent of your discretion in broadening access to education?
4. When you think of diversity in higher education, what comes to mind?
5. What does affirmative action in higher education mean to you?
6. At your institution, what are the advantages of an affirmative action policy?
7. What are the extent of your discretion in implementing diversity and affirmative action at your institution?
8. What has been the impact of your leadership on access to education for those groups of students who have been traditionally underrepresented at your institution?
9. What is your point of view of the OFI and SANPHE?
  - What does this policy mean for you?
10. In terms of implementation, what were some of the challenges you faced?



Section Two — Used to interview political officials directly or indirectly involved in crafting the policy documents.

1. From your point of view, what is the role of higher education to your country?
2. What does access to higher education mean for your country?
3. What part does diversity play in higher education?
4. What are your views about affirmative action policies in higher education?
5. How you do see the current climate for higher education opportunities for those who have been traditionally discriminated against?
6. For the SANPHE: What do you think precipitated the need to enact the policy?
  - What does SANPHE mean for South Africa?
7. Do you believe the SANPHE will increase opportunities for those who have been traditionally underrepresented in higher education? If yes, in what ways?
8. What is your view about the role of senior university administrators in implementing the SANPHE?
  - Do you believe they have any discretion in implementing the SANPHE?

## APPENDIX H: *Coding Protocol*

The general purpose of this study is to (1) examine the issues senior educational leaders face in implementing the One Florida Initiative and the South African National Plan for Higher Education and (2) describe the impact these policies have had on one higher education institution within each nation.

This Coding Protocol seeks to provide the necessary instructions for each coder—the individual who checks the policy document for the presence of the variables and descriptors that indicate access to higher education (Hodson, 1999; Krippendorff, 1980; Neuendorf, 2002). Access to higher education refers to increasing enrollments for minority students in colleges, institutes and universities.

A Likert scale will be used to measure the presence of the access-to-higher education variables (race-conscious admission criteria, affirmative action and diversity) in the policy documents. The levels of agreement are:

- 1 = Strongly Agree
- 2 = Agree
- 3 = Neutral (Neither Agree nor Disagree)
- 4 = Disagree
- 5 = Strongly Disagree

Instructions: For each question below, please assign one of the Likert scales score to indicate your level of agreement with each question.

### PART I

The One Florida Initiative (OFI) essentially calls for the elimination of race and ethnicity as a factor in university admissions. For OFI— here are the questions:

1. Does the educational component of the OFI as stated give the assurance (steps will be taken to either increase access, or corrective action to increase access or redress or remedy inequities) that access to higher education will be increased for those who have been traditionally discriminated against?
2. Have issues of diversity and affirmative action been adequately addressed in the OFI to give the assurance (steps will be taken to either increase access, or corrective action to increase access or redress or remedy inequities) that access to higher education will be increased for those who have been traditionally discriminated against?
3. Does the OFI as stated gives senior university administrators the discretion to develop programs to increase access to higher education for those who have been traditionally discriminated against?
4. Do you think the OFI is a well thought out plan that addresses the issue of access to higher education?
5. Is the educational component of the OFI seen as a step backward from gains in affirmative action and diversity programs that have been specifically designed to increase access?
6. Would the elimination of race as a factor in the admissions criteria cause the decrease of enrollment for those who have been traditionally discriminated against?
7. What would you like to see included in OFI to increase access to higher education for those who have been traditionally discriminated against? (Your comments, please).
8. Overall, what do you think about the One Florida Initiative? (Your comments, please).

## **PART II**

The South African National Plan for Higher Education (SANPHE) is based on a policy framework that seeks to redress past inequalities in the country's education system. SANPHE calls for providing increased access to higher education to all irrespective of race, gender, age, creed, class or disability and to promote equity of access.

For the SANPHE — here are the questions:

- 1 Does Section 1, paragraph 1.1 (Context: Challenges facing higher education) as stated in the SANPHE give the assurance (steps will be taken to either increase access, or corrective action to increase access or redress or remedy inequities) that access to higher education will be increased for those who have been traditionally discriminated against? **REFERENCE LINES 405 TO 513.**

NOTE: The remaining thirty-four questions use the same format as question number 1 and they cite each of their respective paragraphs. The questions are not listed here because they may appear to be redundant.

The following two questions were asked of each coder.

1. What would you like to see included in SANPHE to increase access to higher education for those who have been traditionally discriminated against?
2. Overall, what do you think about the SANPHE?

## APPENDIX I

SELECTED EXCERPTS FROM INTERVIEW WITH PRESIDENT OF A KEY  
STATE-UNIVERSITY IN FLORIDA—CONDUCTED ON SITE ON DECEMBER 16,  
2003.

*Researcher:* How do you view your role as a senior university leader?

*Participant:* I think that the position as President at this University is certainly a position that provides a great deal of opportunity to give leadership to the development of this university and higher education in general in Florida.

*Researcher:* What does effective leadership mean to you?

*Participant:* I think effective leadership is leadership in which you try to determine what the goals and potential of the institution are, and in which, you are leading by eliciting that really from the facts available and from the views of those with whom you are working. And getting a coalescing of the leadership in the various constituencies with whom you work to agree upon those goals and work towards them. I think that is the first job, and then I think given that overall goal which is to be able to determine the effective means of achieving it. And getting those who need to implement it, to get it done.

*Researcher:* What is your style of leadership?

*Participant:* I would describe my style of leadership as one in which it is very important to have substantial involvement of all the people that are engaged in the process. I exercise participatory leadership. I'm a decision-maker having no qualms about making hard decisions—making decisions in a short period of time. But I believe good decisions are those in which as many as those who are knowledgeable and involved in the outcome and the implementation of it should be heard. So, I think I am a good listener. I like to gather people together to look at a problem, have a discussion of it and then make a decision about how to go.

*Researcher:* What does access to higher education mean to you?

*Participant:* The first element I think of access to higher education is to be given the tools in the pre-collegiate education to enable you to be admitted, to enable you to take advantage of the opportunities that are presented in higher education. So, a good education preparatory to higher education is seen as required for access.

*Researcher:* As the senior leader, what is the extent of your discretion in broadening access to higher education?

*Participant:* We are very selective—so access, in the first instance has to be—it requires a very high level of pre-college attainment—in terms of grades, test scores and of the other indices which we use and which are focused primarily on academic qualifications. But we also take into account economic and socio-economic considerations.

*Researcher:* What are some of the things you have done to broaden access for those who have been traditionally discriminated against?

*Participant:* I think you have to go back to the One Florida Initiative. Before One Florida, this University was engaged I think very thoughtfully in affirmative action. Affirmative action has been tarred by a lot of people by assuming it is something that it isn't. Affirmative action is used here and it has been used at other Universities—it is generally a process by which we took into account race and ethnicity in looking at all of the qualifications we used in selecting or in admitting students.

With the implementation of the One Florida Initiative, the ability to use the tools of affirmative action and affirmative action as has been generally understood and used was no longer available. So, we have had to develop other means of accomplishing as much in terms of access for those not within the prior mainstream and for those traditionally discriminated against as best as we could.

The general method we have used is to move to what I call holistic admission policies—taking into account a whole range of criteria but still weighting the academic qualifications very highly. We can't look specifically at race, ethnicity or religion along with a lot of other things, age and so forth. But we look at economic backgrounds, we look at places of residency, and we look at particular high schools where there has been a very low rate of attendance in colleges and universities. We have selected certain schools to work with particularly because we believe there are many students who if given the proper opportunities at those schools and given an opportunity would succeed.

*Researcher:* What is your point of view of the One Florida Initiative?

*Participant:* I opposed it when it was discussed and proposed by the Governor. I opposed it when the Board of Regents adopted it. I opposed it in the first place because it was bad public policy. I think affirmative action reasonably implemented a sound public

policy. I believe to have a policy that says we are not going to have affirmative action but we are going to try to do things that would amount to the same things that would occur if we did use it is not the right way to go. I said it would make it very difficult for this University to continue a strong program of access and that we would indeed lose ground. And we did lose ground despite what I think were our heroic efforts that we started long before it was implemented and work with people all over the country.

We brought in consultants and developed a very good program. But I said we would work hard to overcome the problems created by One Florida. We overcome them to a very substantial extent and we've gotten back to where we were. We are going to see additional progress. The progress will not be as fast and we will have lost substantial ground over a period of five or six years. We lost a couple of years—we are coming back, but we are no way near where we would have been had we been able to operate under the affirmative action policy which preceded One Florida.

*Researcher:* In terms of implementation, what were some of the challenges you faced to maintain access to higher education when the One Florida Initiative became law?

*Participant:* Finding ways to modify the admissions policy that would have enabled us to provide broader access without violating the principles of One Florida. And it was a number of things, but that simply stated, was what it was.



## APPENDIX J

SELECTED EXCERPTS FROM INTERVIEW WITH A PROVOST OF A KEY  
STATE-UNIVERSITY IN FLORIDA—CONDUCTED ON SITE ON DECEMBER 16,  
2003.

*Researcher:* How do you view your role as one of the senior university leaders at this institution in the context of admissions?

*Participant:* I think from my research and work as a historian, I believe strongly in access. And I believe philosophically that having a diverse student body is essential to the educational process.

*Researcher:* What does access to higher education mean to you in the context of those who have been traditionally discriminated against?

*Participant:* Well, access previously meant—prior to the One Florida Initiative—an aggressive use of affirmative action to provide for a diversified student body.

*Researcher:* What does effective leadership mean to you in the context of what you do?

*Participant:* When I became Provost, I was concerned about the way we did admission at this University. All we looked at were the SAT's and GPA's of the students. I just felt personally offended by that policy. When Governor Jeb Bush of Florida, made a dramatic change in the use of affirmative action, that really pushed me more even strongly to reexamine the way we were doing admission at this University.

*Researcher:* When you think of diversity, what comes to mind?

*Participant:* Diversity in education means a diverse student body representative of all segments of American society that in my way of thinking is the ideal for the world—to reflect a diversity of our society that diversity ought to be in existence in our society.

*Researcher:* What does affirmative action mean to you?

*Participant:* Affirmative action was an aggressive use of race to diversify our student body to overcome the legacy of segregation in particular to make sure that Black citizens and the children of Black citizens had access to this University.

*Researcher:* Are there any aspects of diversity and affirmative action you disagree with?

*Participant:* Philosophically, I was always troubled by affirmative action in that it was the only way we could provide an integrated academic environment. Like many Americans, I think I felt we had to use some extraordinary measures to overcome the legacy of the past and like many Americans I was willing to use affirmative action to try to counterbalance the legacy of segregation.

*Researcher:* What are some of the weaknesses of affirmative action and diversity that challenge leaders like yourself?

*Participant:* The weakness of affirmative action was that of course you ended up discriminating against somebody. The admission policy to be frank with you is that you always make a tough decision especially in a highly selective institution. You make judgment calls—those judgment calls are going to be a gray line often between one student who would fit in and another who might not.

*Researcher:* What is the extent of your discretion in implementing diversity and affirmative action programs in the context of access to higher education at your institution?

*Participant:* Actually, the president and the provost have fairly wide discretionary powers within an institution to implement policies and procedures in these areas.

*Researcher:* What is your view of the One Florida Initiative (OFI)?

*Participant:* The OFI was quite a challenge for us because we had been using affirmative action as was mentioned. We have been using race as a factor in our decision making process for admissions. It gave us certain comfort levels to diversify our student body.

*Researcher:* What are some of the advantages or shortcomings of OFI?

*Participant:* For us, what it forced us to do was to look seriously and substantively at our admission process. We had to go back to the drawing board and say “Okay, there is a new policy in place that does not allow us to use race—What can we do in our admission policy to make it more equitable for everybody that applied?” And so what we did was we put in place an admissions policy that looked at the students’ entire record and their response to essay questions.

*Researcher:* And in terms of implementation of the One Florida Initiative, what were some of the challenges you faced?

*Participant:* The other critical component of this was we decided when we were building our admission policy to develop alliances and programs with predominately minority schools in Florida that were in trouble educationally.

*Researcher:* Is there anything particularly about your philosophy and your style that guide you in broadening access to higher education?

*Participant:* Basically, I just believe that the American cultural fabric and the diversity of its population and its citizenry are something that is extraordinarily important.

We have an obligation as an institution of higher education to see that access is provided to all those groups of citizens. I think in the classroom students learn about half of what they learn from one another and the other half they learn from the faculty member. I think to have diversified views in which students are asking questions from different perspectives or offering answers from different perspectives—that that educational experience is fundamental to the educational process and the advancement of the educational learning experience of our students.

We also have a lot of conversations with our students about how to treat one another. So we've done a lot of things. Some of them are working well. We have to continue to reexamine them because I don't think we have got the solutions yet. Things have gotten a lot better here but we continue to believe we can improve a lot more. So that's where we are.

## APPENDIX K

SELECTED EXCERPTS FROM INTERVIEW WITH A VICE CHANCELLOR AT A  
TRADITIONALLY WHITE AND ENGLISH SOUTH AFRICAN UNIVERSITY—  
CONDUCTED ON SITE ON 4 DECEMBER 2003.

*Researcher:* How do you view your role as the senior university leader?

*Participant:* I don't see my role purely as an administrator. I am here to lead the University obviously with the assistance of the various senior colleagues and senior academics, etc.

*Researcher:* How do you view your style of leadership?

*Participant:* I have a very open door policy. I think I lead by example and I allow people to have freedom. We interact but I am not afraid to make decisions when they got to be made. I certainly consult and I think we have a very collegial and a very participatory management style within the University. And again, being small, our Senate plays a major role.

*Researcher:* What does effective leadership mean to you?

*Participant:* It means taking the University as a quality institution in our present new context in South Africa along the lines of quality teaching and quality research and that's where I see us leading this institution to become really a quality international and African University.

*Researcher:* What does access to higher education mean to you?

*Participant:* Obviously, coming out of the apartheid era when this University by law was only allowed to have White students and White staff—for us, it was a major change.

For us, the University actually opened up well before 1994 as it became apparent in the 1980s and the early 1990s, particularly after Mandela was released from prison. We are forty-seven percent Black at the present time—that's generic Black in South African terms, that's thirty-six percent African Black, ten percent Indian and one percent in the South African term, colored. And that's has been achieved relatively quickly. We intend on increasing that.

We could just take, White and Black students from an advantaged school background—I don't see that we should be doing that. We would be comfortable to do it but we have an obligation I believe as far as access is concerned to look for potential particularly Black school leavers from rural schools who haven't had the advantages but have huge potential. So, we will continue.

*Researcher:* What is the extent to your discretion to broadening access to higher education at this institution?

*Participant:* Our approach to that is we have differential entry, so we will take rural people from disadvantaged schools with lower paper qualifications than other people. And we have differential process that will take longer and have a differential process rather we have a foundation year, mentorships, etc. to make quite sure that they succeed. The differential process will take longer because of their background but absolutely critical, is equal exit. And you got to work at this because it would be very easy to have

Black University graduates and White University graduates—many universities do make an error as far as this is concerned.

*Researcher:* Do you believe it is vital for you as a senior leader to set a tone within your institution to ensure equal exit for your students?

*Participant:* Absolutely! It is absolutely critical. That tone and those words—differential entry, process, progress but equal exit is critically important. In the same way, it is getting the systems in place as far as transformation.

*Researcher:* When you think of diversity in higher education, what comes to mind?

*Participant:* Well, I think diversity in many different backgrounds in people who teach so there obviously is diversity of people coming in and bringing in different cultures and different approaches. This again means that one has to have different approaches in diversity in which one teaches. It makes you think. So, diversity challenges everybody, and it is good.

*Researcher:* What is beneficial about diversity?

*Participant:* I think it is different approaches to teaching because you have people with different diverse backgrounds. Not that that means lowering of standards because everybody thinks just because of that—no way. Not only does diversity force you to look at your methods of teaching and I believe improve them as a result, it also, broadens your approach to research and opens different areas of research—looking at problems in different ways.

*Researcher:* What aspects of diversity do you disagree with?

*Participant:* I don't agree with any aspect of diversity as long as it doesn't become a soft option.

*Researcher:* What does affirmative action mean to you?

*Participant:* First of all, it means access for students, and then staff. Perhaps, one of the worst things that happened in the apartheid-era is that the apartheid government was scared of a Black middle class. So they went out of their way to deny access of Blacks to any type of education, particularly higher education that would make them succeed in the market place, in government, etc. You got to remember that we came out of forty years of forced living apart. And unless you work at living together, it doesn't happen. And it has only been ten years since the change of government. It's very exciting and I think what we have achieved is remarkable particularly as I say with regards to the numbers and integration of Black students.

*Researcher:* What is your point of view of the South African National Plan for Higher Education (SANPHE)?

*Participant:* It is a very good document. We've had a lot of documents the last three years over the uncertainty of restructuring of our higher education. The SANPHE is a very good document. There is little you can find wrong with it.

*Researcher:* In redressing past inequities, do you think the SANPHE will be able to achieve that?

*Participant:* Yes, we are already doing that in regard to the students we are taking and trying to change our staff profile. And that's happening nationally. I mean there are now



more Black students at historically White Universities than are at historically Black Universities and it is happening across the country.

*Researcher:* What does this policy mean for you?

*Participant:* Well, it gives us a framework to ensure our policies within the university fit in with the good of the overall National Plan. So, if it were a bad National Plan, we wouldn't want to contribute to it. The philosophy of that document agrees with the philosophy here.

*Researcher:* What are some of the challenges you will face in implementing the SANPHE?

*Participant:* The major one is student access and the curriculum changes that we've done. The main one I want to get back to is academic staff profile which is a big challenge and which will not happen as quickly as possible as that document would like it to happen.

*Researcher:* And what is the disadvantage of that from your point of view?

*Participant:* From my point of view, it really interferes with autonomy that they may want you to push things that are not feasible. So, I see the potential for conflict where particularly if you can get a person with a particular ideology who would clash with their ideology with regard to what I believe our University should be doing.

*Researcher:* What are some of your attributes that help to guide you in your relationships with government officials in Pretoria?

*Participant:* I have the research and teaching credentials. I believe that is critical for a vice-chancellor. I am not a believer in the businessperson coming in. So, I get that

respect from all the academics and students within the University. That excellence as far as I am concerned carries over in interacting with government officials and the Minister. The Minister knows when I talk about science, I've done it and he will listen. When I talk about teaching, I've done it. I've been very lucky in my career to have been able to build up good academic credentials.

*Researcher:* What is the value of higher education to your country?

*Participant:* Absolutely huge. As I said, when we came out of the apartheid era we had a real lack of qualified people in all areas. Degreed people in this country have a huge opportunity—the country needs them. Education is going to be absolutely critical in particularly in higher education in this country.

*Researcher:* During the apartheid era, the government did restrict access and is the climate now different to broaden access?

*Participant:* Totally different. It is really urgent to produce high quality people.

## APPENDIX L

SELECTED EXCERPTS FROM INTERVIEW WITH A REGISTRAR AT A  
TRADITIONALLY WHITE AND ENGLISH SOUTH AFRICAN UNIVERSITY—  
CONDUCTED ON SITE ON 4 DECEMBER 2003.

*Researcher:* What does the role of higher education mean to your country?

*Participant:* Oh, it is essential. I am sure you are aware it is a developing country and although there is a massive unemployment problem in the country, at the other end of the scale, there is a huge shortage of higher-level skills and training. That's the market we are in the field—we are in to fill that gap or at least make the attempts to do so. I think this University has made an important contribution.

*Researcher:* What does effective management mean to you?

*Participant:* For me, leadership is centered on two things. One is providing vision and guidance and setting the direction—not in an autocratic manner but certainly being the person who is constantly looking where can this go, or where can we take this issue or task or whatever. And the second one is a kind of modeling in my division—trying to work much harder than anyone else, trying to work at all the necessary things, the task activities, the relationship activities and so on. One is trying to be an example; a model for the staff, and the other, is to take responsibility for the strategic direction and leadership.

*Researcher:* Do you find it challenging?

*Participant:* Oh, it is very challenging. We went through massive restructuring three years ago and that has been a real stormy process. It is the first time I have been really involved in any thing on that scale, personally. It has been really difficult in some respects. I've done a lot of reading beforehand and in spite of that, I fell into all the usual traps. But it has turned out well, and the goals we have set have been achieved—but it has been a long hard three years.

*Researcher:* What does access to higher education mean to you?

*Participant:* A problem. It is a problem in South Africa because of the history of apartheid. Apartheid has done this country a massive disservice obviously—particularly in the area of education—where we are left with a legacy of a whole lot of really atrocious schools—I mean they are disastrous. And so we have the social responsibility of doing some things about trying to put together some of the pieces in what was a result of the apartheid picture. We have to go looking for potential rather than achievement. So, admission in South Africa's higher education is a really difficult thing. There is no easy way of doing it and very often we get it wrong. And we are very conscious of the difficulties that arise when we do get it wrong.

*Researcher:* What is the extent of your discretion in broadening access to higher education?

*Participant:* We would look at what the student has done and if in a bad schooling situation, as for example, that student has been one of the stars in that bad situation, we would consider that person.

*Researcher:* When you think of diversity, what comes to mind in the context of higher education?

*Participant:* Diversity for us is a racial thing. We are now at 49 percent White and 51 percent Blacks, Colored and Asians. That is diversity by race.

*Researcher:* What's beneficial about diversity at this University?

*Participant:* For the individuals it would be broadening of understanding of having to understand someone who comes from a very, very difficult situation and learning to not just cope in that but to welcome diversity and to see it as an enriching experience.

Another one would be the ability to operate globally and to learn in an environment where you are just not looking parochially at the South African situation and learning to be a player in the South African economy or business world but to be able to operate internationally. And then obviously, tolerance. Being able to cope with diversity and not reduce everything to my own prejudices what ever.

*Researcher:* Are there any aspects of it that you disagree with?

*Participant:* That's an interesting question—I guess, yes. The answer must be yes.

There are some things I just don't like in diversity. This is tricky because we are getting into political issues—would be a kind of “dumbing down” of things in the name of culture.

*Researcher:* When you think of affirmative action, what comes to mind?

*Participant:* Look, I have very mixed feelings about affirmative action. On one hand, it is a clearly necessary in South Africa. It is the only way we've been able to address

previous imbalances of power, of privilege, and just access to all sorts of things. So from that point-of-view, I have no difficulty with it.

*Researcher:* What is your view of the South African National Plan for Higher Education (SANPHE)?

*Participant:* I think it is a good one. I'm just nervous that they are moving too fast. If we look at what we have done the past few years, we actually achieved an incredible amount.

Something we haven't been talking about—our programs—our qualifications they have been entirely reworked in terms of outcomes-based education. The whole method of assessment has been changed. Now those are fundamental issues for higher education and it has led to a great deal of work in all the Universities. The restructuring of higher education in terms of size and shape of the landscape is profound. It has affected us quite severely at this University.

*Researcher:* Do you think this plan will redress past inequities?

*Participant:* I think the answer is yes but it is not going to be possible to do as envisaged. The basic political problem is that apartheid government created a whole lot of universities. Black universities, in the sense they were created solely for Black students and they were placed in what were called the homelands—they were placed in all the wrong places—where there was no urban base—just nothing. Now, that is the problem the Minister has inherited.

*Researcher:* What are some of the advantages or shortcomings of the SANPHE?

*Participant:* I think the advantages are that the real needs of the country are being addressed. There is a massive drive towards quality. I think that's one of the real advantages. For the first time probably ever there is a strong drive towards quality in the whole system.

*Researcher:* What are some things you need to do to implement the SANPHE?

*Participant:* I think the things are involving more people in the decision making so they are aware of where we are going and why we are doing it. That would be a major one just consulting people and I think the consultation would be the biggest thing.

*Researcher:* And if the outcome doesn't meet the government expectations, what do you think the government will do?

*Participant:* What I think from that point-of-view—what we are really seeing is what they are doing and that they are being more prescriptive than the government has ever been.

*Researcher:* Are there any final comments you would like to make about what you do in terms of increasing access to higher education?

*Participant:* I think it means constantly learning. Nothing is stable in this situation. It means, reading a lot and a lot of networking with colleagues to ensure one understands what is required and one can make some meaningful contribution to the national debates.

The other would be to be as proactive as possible in this situation to ensure we are not getting into a reactive mode and always be in a kind of step behind. So it's that kind of thing—looking for ways to be creative and proactive in these sorts of situations. That for me would be the biggest challenge.

## APPENDIX M

SELECTED EXCERPTS FROM INTERVIEW WITH A SENIOR OFFICIAL AT  
SOUTH AFRICA'S MINISTRY OF EDUCATION—CONDUCTED ON SITE ON  
DECEMBER 9, 2003.

*Researcher:* From your point of view, what is the role of higher education to your country?

*Participant:* Quite clearly, I suppose higher education plays a very important role in contributing to developing the higher-level skills that will be required in the labor force and to undertake the research for our social and economic strategies.

*Researcher:* What does access to higher education mean to your country?

*Participant:* Clearly, the major problem for access for us is to address the problem that access in the past has been restricted. It was restricted at the large research universities and more generally in terms of state policy. In a quantitative sense, access has changed. There are more Black students in the majority and the latest data show seventy percent are Black students but in the proportional sense, Black students continue to be underrepresented. Access clearly is a major issue for us in addressing what was the historical legacy of apartheid.

*Researcher:* What part does diversity play in higher education?



*Participant:* Diversity in this sense is a major challenge in the higher education system.

I don't think it is an issue that's been adequately addressed. It is a difficult issue to address. And we certainly have not focused on the issue, as much because I suppose it is a soft-policy issue—it is a more difficult issue to change. But it is more difficult to change cultures and organizational cultures, etc. and that is a key problem and challenge that faces us.

*Researcher:* How does the government feel about some traditionally White universities still using the Afrikaans language?

*Participant:* Firstly, as you know we have eleven official languages. So we are not in the business of downgrading those languages that have a current status. Our concern is not so much Afrikaans—we are not so much opposed to the continued provision of higher education institutions using Afrikaans as long as it is not a barrier of access to the African communities. We have a language policy that suggests the institutions should be opened up—that access should not be a barrier and certainly in areas of post-graduate programs by and large should be done in English.

*Researcher:* What are your views about affirmative action policies in higher education?

*Participant:* Well, I suppose our major concern from an access point of view is that institutions must start representing the demographic realities of the society. As I said the level of students is changing. We have not set quotas. We opposed to quotas because we do not believe in quotas—they have become artificial constructs in that institutions are more than likely not able to meet because there are enormous difficulties in recruiting appropriately trained Black students to higher education because of problems in the

school system. It is very easy for us to set a quota and set the institutions to fail because the people are not coming out of the school system.

*Researcher:* How do you see the current climate for higher education opportunities for those who have been traditionally discriminated against?

*Participant:* Oh, the opportunities have opened up and there are opportunities now that didn't exist before.

*Researcher:* What was the genesis of the South African National Plan for Higher Education (SANPHE)?

*Participant:* We inherited a higher education system that essentially had no planning and if there was, it was of a perverse sort. So institutions were pretty much alone and it was sometimes hard to believe this under apartheid—as long as you didn't traverse the apartheid code, you were left pretty much (at least at the White institution) to do what you wanted to do. And so we introduced in the White Paper as a notion of the planning process in higher education not in a manpower planning sense but because there needs to be a framework that would drive the social and political agenda of the new government on equity and all the other issues. And then we started a process of getting institutions to develop institutional plans. And it was quite clear why it was possible for institutions to interpret broad policy directives, etc. that we needed an overall framework, that would set fairly clear parameters of what our priorities were and what we expected our institutions to do. And in a sense we could start with the SANPHE but we chose not to because we needed to better understand what was going on in higher education at the institutional level. So it is out of that process that we then developed the SANPHE to indicate what our key priorities and parameters would be within which we would expect institutions to

respond. And if they did not respond there is a possibility there would be action taken in terms of funding. There was a whole process in its genesis and taking into account all of what had come out of the institutional process at that level. So we needed to give them a clear framework for which institutions would start thinking in the long term in what they wanted to do

*Researcher:* In terms of the broad higher education landscape, what does this plan mean for South Africa?

*Participant:* We have a general problem with access—so clearly, our focus from the SANPHE point of view would be to start targeting areas that we think are critical. We are not keen on setting quotas. So there is a whole set of initiatives in place, which would enable institutions to access resources to develop programs in a sense to facilitate access for students.

*Researcher:* What are your expectations about SANPHE to provide access for those who have been traditionally discriminated against?

*Participant:* The numbers are growing and even the participation rates have gone up. The graduation rates have slowed and that's the target area we are focusing on providing money to getting institutions to develop the appropriate support methods. That would be a key focus for us

*Researcher:* What is your view of senior university leaders' role in implementing SANPHE?

*Participant:* Higher education in this country is autonomous. In the U.S. there are greater government controls for state universities. We don't control the institutions but

there is a perception that we do. But institutions are autonomous. The only power we have is the power of resources but that is a power in a limited sense. The critical power in higher education is at the institutional level. We have weak leadership in our education system—management of leadership is a critical challenge for us. A lot of our problems are that we don't have strong leadership echelons in our institutions to drive change agendas in institutions.

*Researcher:* Are there any other comments you wish to make about what this policy means for South Africa?

*Participant:* I think redressing the past is a very complex process especially when you have a range of institutions that were developed by very different intentions by the old regime.

So, there is one argument that says redress means to level the playing field—you take from the rich and give to the poor. We certainly don't see it in that fashion or we don't have the resources. We don't have the money to pump to level the playing field. That would be fine but we don't have the money to do it. But money is also not the problem. It is part of the problem—it is not only the problem. We have been pumping in resources into the institutions that frankly we should not be doing because there are such deep underlining structural problems in those institutions that any amount of resources is not going to resolve those problems.

People have access, so it is changing. Some of the problems we have are that some may be addressed at the local level but currently are not being addressed because parents and students are more focused on getting their kids out of the system rather than

trying to address the problems in the system. I suppose in that sense we are becoming a more normal society.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, D, W. (1995). *Education for extinction: American Indians and the boarding school experience, 1875-1928*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Alexander, K. (1993). Purpose of education: Peace, capitalism and nationalism. In K. Alexander, & D. Inman-Freitas (Eds.), *The 1993 Oxford International Round Table on Educational Policy. The faces of education: A worldview* (pp. 17-28). Oxford: Oxford University.
- Altbach, P. G. (1999). Patterns in higher education. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumpert (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp 15-37). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Altbach, P. G., Lomotey, K., & Rivers, S. (2002). Race in higher education: The continuing crises. In W. A. Smith, P. G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crises in American higher education* (Rev. ed.), (pp. 23-41). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Anderson, G. M. (1999). Building a people's university in South Africa: Race, compensatory education and the structural limits of democratic reform at the University of the Western Cape (Doctoral dissertation, The City University of New York, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(01A), 76.

- Anderson, J. D. (2002). Race in American higher education: Historical perspectives on current conditions. In W. A. Smith, P. G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crises in American higher education* (Rev. ed.), (pp. 3-21). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ball, H. (2000). *The Bakke case: Race, education and affirmative action*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Barnett, R. (1990). *The idea of higher education*. Bristol, PA: Open University Press.
- Bargh, C., Bocock, J., Scott, P., & Smith, D. (2000). *University leadership: The role of the chief executive*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (Eds.). (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Beck, R. B. (2000). *The history of South Africa*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Bell, D. I. (2001). An inquiry into the emergence of transformative leadership in higher education in South Africa: A phenomenographic study (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62(04A), 1336.
- Bennis, W. G. (1999). The secrets of great groups. In F. Hesselbein & P. M. Cohen (Eds.), *Leader to leader* (pp. 315-322). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Berdahl, R. O., Altbach, P. G., & Gumport, P. J. (1999). The contexts of American higher education. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 1-11). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Berkhofer, R. F., Jr. (1978). *The Whiteman's Indians*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Berger, M. C., & Kostal, T. (2002). Financial resources, regulation, and enrollment in US public higher education. *Economics of Education Review*, 21(2), 101-110.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (1998). *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Broida, B. (2004, February 20). National group issues guidelines for improving access to college. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved February 20, 2004, from <http://chronicle.com/prm/daily/2004/02/2004022001n.htm>
- Brown, R. H. (2002). Diversity and multiculturalism: Struggles for the campus culture-overcoming educational exclusion-Is diversity an appropriate model for democratic higher education? *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(7), 1061-1087.
- Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).



- Brunner, B. R. (2000). Measuring students' perceptions of the university of Florida's commitment to public relationships and diversity (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51(08A), 2970.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bush, G. W. (2003). President Bush discusses Michigan affirmative action case. Retrieved February 13, 2003, from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030115-7.htm>
- Bush, J. (2000a). *Announcement of the One Florida Initiative*. Retrieved July 2, 2001, [http://www.myflorida.com/myflorida/gover.../one\\_florida/announcementInitiative.html](http://www.myflorida.com/myflorida/gover.../one_florida/announcementInitiative.html)
- Bush, J. (2000b). *Statement of Governor Jeb Bush on "One Florida" the next step forward*. Retrieved July 3, 2001, [http://www.myflorida.com/myflorida/gover...learn/one\\_florida/statementForward.html](http://www.myflorida.com/myflorida/gover...learn/one_florida/statementForward.html)
- Callan, P. M. (2001). Reframing access and opportunity: Problematic state and federal higher education policy in the 1990s. In D. E. Heller (Ed.), *The states and public higher education policy: Affordability, access, and accountability* (pp. 83-98). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Carcieri, M. D. (2001). The South Carolina secession statement of 1860 and the One Florida Initiative: The limits of a historical analogy and the possibility of racial reconciliation. *St. Thomas Law Review*, 13(2), 577-607.

- Carnoy, M., & Shearer, D. (1980). *Economic democracy: The challenge of the 1980s*. White Plains, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Chapa, J., & Lazaro, V. A. (1998). Hopwood in Texas: The untimely end of affirmative action. In G. Orfield & E. Miller (Eds.), *Chilling Admissions: The affirmative action crises and the search for alternatives* (pp. 51-70). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Charmaz, K. (2003). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 249-291). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Chatman, S. P., & Smith, K. M. (2000). Economic affirmative action and race-blind policies. *College and University Journal*, 76(1), 3-14.
- Chickering, A.W. (1999). Personal qualities and human development in higher education: Assessment in the service of educational goals. In S. J. Messick (Ed.), *Assessment in higher education: Issues of access, quality, student development and public policy* (pp. 13-33). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Civil Rights Act of 1964, Pub. L. No. 88-352.
- Conant, J. B. (1965). *Education and liberty: The role of the schools in a modern democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Conklin, K. & Reindl, T. (2004, February 13). To keep America competitive, states and colleges must work together. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved February 11, 2004, from <http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v50/i23/23b02001.htm>

- Covey, S. R. (1999). The habits of effective organizations. In F. Hesselbein and P. M. Cohen (Eds.), *Leader to leader* (pp. 215-226). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice Hall.
- Davenport, H. R. T., & Sauders, C. (2000). *South Africa: A modern history* (5th. ed.). New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Davies, D., & Brickell, H. (1960). *School board policies*. New London, CT: Croft.
- Davies, J., Hides, M. T., & Casey, S. (2001). Leadership in higher education. *Total Quality Management*, 12(7&8), 1025-1030.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2003). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp.1-45). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dever, J. T. (2001). Chaotic systems: Confounding or confirming the leadership role in higher education? In M. Cutright (Ed.), *Chaos theory and higher education: Leadership, planning and policy* (pp. 195-202). New York: Peter Lang.
- Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: The First Free Press.

- Downey, L. W. (1988). *Policy analysis in education*. Calgary, Canada: Detselig Enterprises Limited.
- Drucker, P. F. (1999). The discipline of innovation. In F. Hesselbein & P. M. Cohen (Eds.), *Leader to leader* (pp. 53-67). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Drummond, T. D. (1994). A policy analysis of access to higher education in the original Adams States for Black undergraduates students: 1979-1983 case studies of Oklahoma and Virginia (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 55(06A), 1481.
- Dyasi, M. M. (1999). Beyond apartheid: Public higher education policy reform in South Africa (1978-1998) (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(11A), 3927.
- Dye, T. R. (2001). *Top down policymaking*. New York: Chatham House Publishers.
- Eckel, P. D. (2001). A world apart? Higher education transformation in the US and South Africa. *Higher Education Policy*, 14(2), 103-115.
- Eisner, E. W. (1998). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Enslin, P., & Pendlebury, S. (2000). Looking others in the eye: Rights and gender in South African education policy. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 15(4), 431-440.
- Executive Order No. 10925, 3 C.F.R. 448, 450 (1959-63).
- Executive Order No. 11246, 3 C.F.R. 339 (1964-65).

- Fowler, F. C. (2000). *Policy studies for educational leaders: An introduction*. Upper Saddle River: NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Fulton, O. (1989). Introduction. In O. Fulton (Ed.), *Access and institutional change* (pp. 1-4). Bristol, PA: Open University Press.
- Fulton, O., & Ellwood, S. (1989). Admissions, access and institutional change. In O. Fulton (Ed.), *Access and institutional change* (pp. 29-50). Bristol, PA: Open University Press.
- Gardner, D. P. (1999). Meeting the challenges of the new millennium: The university's role. In W. Z. Hirsch & L. Weber (Eds.), *Challenges facing higher education at the millennium* (pp. 18-25). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Gaston, P. M. (2001). Reflections on affirmative action: Its origins, virtues, enemies, champions and prospects. In G. Orfield & M. Kurlaender (Eds.), *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 277-293). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ginsburg, R. B. (2000). Affirmative action as an international human rights dialogue. *Brookings Review*, 18(1), 2-3.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Gleick, J. (1987). *Chaos: Making a new science*. New York: Penguin.

*Glion Declaration* (1998). Retrieved June 28, 2002,

[http://www.glion.org/preface\\_en.htm](http://www.glion.org/preface_en.htm)

Golden, D. (2004, January 13). No more boost for 'legacies' at Texas A&M. *The Wall Street Journal*, pp. B1, B4.

Good, J., Halpin, G., & Halpin, G. (2002). Retaining Black students in engineering: Do minority programs have a longitudinal impact? *Journal of College Student Retention*, 34(4), 351-364.

Gratz v. Bollinger, 122 F. Supp.811 (D. Mich. December, 2000)

Gray, J. H., & Densten, I. L. (1998). Integrating quantitative and qualitative analysis using latent and manifest variables. *Quality & Quantity*, 32, 419-431.

Graybill, L. S. (1998). Pursuit of truth and reconciliation in South Africa. *Africa Today*, 45(1), 103-133.

Greenhouse, L. (2003, June 24). Justices back affirmative action by 5 to 4, but wider vote bans a racial point system. *The New York Times*, pp. A1, A22.

Grundy, K. W. (2000). South Africa: Transition to majority rule, transformation to stable democracy. In Y. Bradshaw, & S. N. Ndegwa (Eds.). *The uncertain promise of Southern Africa* (pp. 27-66). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Grutter v. Bollinger, 288 F. 3d 732 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. Mich. 2002).

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). *Effective evaluation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Gutto, S. B. O. (1998). Beyond justiciability: Challenges of implementing/enforcing socio-economic rights in South Africa. *Buffalo Human Rights Law Review*, 6, 79-102.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Harvey, W. B. (2001). *Minorities in higher education 2000-2001: Eighteenth annual status report*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Hassim, A. (2000). *Affirmative action policies in the United States and South Africa: A comparative study*. Retrieved June 18, 2002, [http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/doc...1&\\_md5=29e887cab2946f2293c3761001b64bc](http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/doc...1&_md5=29e887cab2946f2293c3761001b64bc). Saint Louis University School of Law, Saint Lois-Warsaw Transatlantic Law Journal.
- Heller, D. E. (2001). Introduction: The changing dynamics of affordability, access, and accountability in public higher education. In D. E. Heller (Ed.), *The states and public higher education policy: Affordability, access, and accountability* (pp. 1-8). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hirsch, W. Z., & Weber, L. (1999). Appendix: The Glion declaration - The university at the millennium. In W. Z. Hirsch & L. Weber (Eds.), *Challenges facing higher education at the millennium* (pp. 177-182). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Hodson, R. (1999). *Analyzing documentary accounts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1995). *The active interview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hopwood v. Texas, 78 F. 3d 932, 944 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996).
- Horn, C. L., & Flores, S. M. (2003). *Percent plans in college admissions: A comparative analysis of three states' experiences*. Retrieved February 13, 2003, <http://www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/research/affirmativeaction/tristate.php>
- Hurtado, S. (2001). Linking diversity and educational purpose: How diversity affects the classroom environment and student development. In G. Orfield & M. Kurlaender (Eds.). *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 187-204). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Hurtado, S., Inkelas, K. K., Briggs, C., & Rhee, B. S. (1997). Differences in college access and choice among racial/ethnic groups: Identifying continuing barriers. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(1), 43-75.
- Hy, R. J. (2000). Education is an investment: A case study. *Journal of Education Finance*, 26(2), 209-218.
- Ibarra, R. A. (2001). *Beyond affirmative action: Reframing the context of higher education*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Immerwahr, J. (2000). *Great expectations: How Floridians view higher education*. Retrieved July 2, 2001, [http://www.higher.education.org/reports/expexctations\\_fl/expectations.shtml](http://www.higher.education.org/reports/expexctations_fl/expectations.shtml)



- Jewell, J. O. (2000). An unfinished mission: Affirmative action, minority admissions, and the politics of mission at the University of California, 1868-1997. *Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1/2), 38-48.
- Jones, M., Yonezawa, S., Ballesteros, E., & Mehan, H. (2002). Shaping pathways to higher education. *Educational Researcher*, 31(2), 3-11.
- Kahn, R., & Cannell, C. (1957). *The dynamics of interviewing*. New York: John Wiley.
- Keppel, F. (1991). The role of public policy in higher education in the United States: Land grants to Pell grants and beyond. In D. H. Finifter, R. G. Baldwin, & J. R. Thelin (Eds.), *The uneasy public policy triangle in higher education* (pp. 9-17). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Kgware, W. M. (1978). The role of black universities in South Africa. In H. W. Van der Merwe & D. Welsh, (Eds.). *The future of the university in southern Africa* (pp. 225-236). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- King, K. L. (2001a). From numerical to comprehensive inclusion: Utilizing experiences in the USA and South Africa to conceptualize a multicultural environment. *Inclusive Education*, 5(1), 67-84.
- King, K. L. (2001b). Is comprehensive racial inclusion an elusive goal for educational institutions in the United States? *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 34(2), 43-53.
- King, M. L., Jr. (1964). *Why we can't wait*. New York: Signet.
- Knight, P. T., & Trowler, P. R. (2001). *Departmental leadership in higher education*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

- Koorts, A. S. (2000). Global, social and economic influences on the access of South African higher education. *Higher Education in Europe*, 25(3), 381-386.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kruss, G. (2001). Towards human rights in South African schools: An agenda for research and practice. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 4(1), 45-62.
- Kulati, T. (2000). Governance, leadership and institutional change in South African higher education: Grappling with instability. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 6(3), 177-192.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interview: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lehman, J. S. (2002, May 16). Learning from diversity. *The New York Times*. Retrieved May 17, 2002: <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/05/16/opinion/16LEHM.html>
- Levinson, B. A. U., & Sutton, M. (2001). Introduction: Policy as/in practice — A sociocultural approach to the study of educational policy. In M. Sutton, & B. A. U. Levinson (Eds.), *Policy as practice: Toward a comparative sociocultural analysis of educational policy* (pp. 1-22). Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

- Lindsay, B., & Justiz, M. J. (2001). The landscape for conceptual and policy issues. In B. Lindsay & M. J. Justiz (Eds.), *The quest for equity in higher education* (pp. 3-29). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Lofland, J. (1971). *Analyzing social settings*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Lomofsky, L., & Lazarus, S. (2001). South Africa: First steps in the development of an inclusive education system. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 31(3), 303-317.
- Lowi, T.J., & Ginsberg, B. (1994). *American government*. New York: Norton.
- Mabokela, R. O. (2001). Student perceptions of institutional racial climate. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 34(3) 70-79.
- Makoni, S., Moody, Sr., C. D., & Mabokela, R. O. (2001). "Separate but equal": A comparative analysis of provision for education of blacks in the United States and South Africa. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 34(3), 45-49.
- Mandela, N. R. (1994). *The long walk to freedom: The autobiography of Nelson Mandela*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.
- Manheim, J. N., Rich, R. C., & Willnat, L. (2002). *Empirical political analysis: Research methods in political science (5<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers.
- Marin, P., & Lee, E. K. (2003). *Appearance and reality in the sunshine state: The Talented 20 Program in Florida*. Retrieved February 13, 2003, <http://www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/research/affirmativeaction/florida>.

- Marshall, C., Mitchell, D., & Wirt, F. (1989). *Culture and education policy in the American states*. New York: The Falmer Press.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1999). *Designing Qualitative research (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mayer-Foulkes, D. (2002). On the dynamics of quality student enrollment at institutions of higher education. *Economics of Education Review*, 21(5), 481-489.
- McLaughlin, T. H. (2000). Philosophy and educational policy: Possibilities, tensions and tasks. *Philosophy and Education Policy*, 15(4), 441-457.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (1997). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction (4<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. New York: Longman.
- McWhirter, D.A. (1996). *The end of affirmative action: Where do we go from here?* New York: Birch Lane Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Messick, S. J. (1999). The changing face of higher education assessment. In S. J. Messick (Ed.), *Assessment in higher education: Issues of access, quality, student development, and public policy* (pp. 3-7). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Milem, J. F. (2001). Increasing diversity benefits: How campus climate and teaching methods affect student outcomes. In G. Orfield & M. Kurlaender (Eds.), *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 233-250). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Mossberg, B. (2001). Leadership's natural ally: Applying chaos and complexity theories to academe. In M. Cutright (Ed.), *Chaos theory and higher education: Leadership, planning and policy* (pp. 203-248). New York: Peter Lang.
- Mumpower, J. L., Nath, R., & Stewart, T. R. (2002). Affirmative action, duality of error, and the consequences of mispredicting the academic performance of African-American college applicants. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 21(1), 63-77.
- Nash, J. B. (1929). Leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 12, 24-25.
- National plan for higher education in South Africa (2001). Retrieved June 27, 2001, [http://education.pwv.gov.za/DoE\\_Sites/Hi-/National%20Plan%20-%20Final%20Draft.htm](http://education.pwv.gov.za/DoE_Sites/Hi-/National%20Plan%20-%20Final%20Draft.htm)
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Newman, J. H. (1853). (Ed. I. T. Ker in 1976). *The idea of a university*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Niebuhr, R. (1960). *Moral man and immoral society: A study in ethics and politics*. New York: Scribners.
- O'Neil, R. (2002, December 13). At last, guidance seems likely on affirmative action. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved December 19, 2002, from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v49/i16/16b02001.htm>
- Orfield, G. (1998). Campus resegregation and its alternatives. In G. Orfield & E. Miller (Eds.), *Chilling admissions: The affirmative action crises and the search for alternatives* (pp. 1-16). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Orfield, G. (2001). Introduction. In G. Orfield & M Kurlaender (Eds.). *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 1-30). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Orfield, G., & Whitley, D. (2001). Diversity and legal education: Student experiences in leading law schools. In G. Orfield & M. Kurlaender (Eds.), *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 143-174). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

*Oxford Electronic Dictionary* (2003). Retrieved June 11, 2003, from [http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry\\_main/00078504?query\\_type=word&queryword=ethnic](http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry_main/00078504?query_type=word&queryword=ethnic)

Palmer, S. R. (2001). Diversity and affirmative action: Evolving principles and continuing legal battles. In G. Orfield & M. Kurlaender (Eds.), *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 81-97). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pathways to College Network (2004). *A shared agenda: A leadership challenge to improve college access and success*. Retrieved February 20, 2004, from [http://www.pathwaystocollege.net/Pub/pub\\_products\\_findings.html](http://www.pathwaystocollege.net/Pub/pub_products_findings.html)

Pedro, E. G. (1997). Equality and education in South Africa: A policy analysis (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58(06A), 2059.

Placier, M., Hall, P. M., McKendall, S. B., & Cockrell, K. S. (2000). Policy as the transformation of intentions: Making multicultural education policy. *Education Policy*, 14(2), 259-289.

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).

Pogue, J. H. (2000). A comparative analyses of graduation rates of African American students at historically Black colleges and universities predominately White institutions (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62(04A), 1345.

Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265(1978).

Rhodes, F. H. T. (2001). *The creation of the future: The role of the American University*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Rhodes, F. H. T. (1998). The university and its critics. In W. G. Bowen & H. T. Shapiro (Eds.), *Universities and their leadership* (pp. 3-14). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of innovation* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Rossouw, H. (2001, June 22). A black short-story writer takes over an elite South African institution. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A40-A42.

Rossouw, H. (2003, August 22). Proposal to centralize admissions rocks South Africa's public colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from August 22, 2003, from <http://chronicle.com/prm/daily/2003/08/2003082205n.htm>

Rowley, L. L., Hurtado, S., & Ponjuan, L. (2002, April). *Organizational rhetoric or reality? The disparities between avowed commitment to diversity and formal programs and initiatives in higher education institutions*. Paper presented at the 83<sup>rd</sup> Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I.S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rudenstine, N. L. (2001). Student diversity and higher learning. In G. Orfield & M. Kurlaender (Eds.). *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 31-48). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ruppert, S. S (2003). *Closing the college participation gap: A national summary*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Rushing, W. (2001). Inequality and education reform: Formulating a macro-historical sociology perspective. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 4(1), 29-44.
- Sadler, P. M., & Hammerman, J. K. (1999). Employing quantitative methods of a qualitative admissions process: Uncovering hidden rules, saving time, and reducing bias. *College and University*, 74(3), 8-24.
- Sax, L. J., & Arredondo, M. (1999). Student attitudes toward affirmative action in college admissions. *Research in Higher Education*, 40(4), 439-459.
- Schmidt, P. (2002a, September 13). High court gets case on affirmative action. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved November 7, 2002, from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v49/i03/03a02501.htm>
- Schmidt, P. (2002b, December 2). U.S. Supreme Court agrees to hear 2 key affirmative-action cases from Michigan. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved December 2, 2002, from <http://chronicle.com/free/2002/12/2002120206n.htm>



- Schmidt, P. (2003a, February 18). Dozens of Supreme Court briefs show widespread support for University of Michigan's admissions policies. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved February 18, 2003, from <http://chronicle.com/daily/2003/02/2003021801n.htm>
- Schmidt, P. (2003b, February 28). Hundreds of groups back U. of Michigan on affirmative action. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved February 24, 2003, from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v49/i25/25a02301.htm>
- Schmidt, P. (2003c, July 4). Affirmative action survives, and so does the debate. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. S1-S4.
- Schmidt, P. (2004, January 11). Washington's governor proposes amending '98 ban to allow return of race-conscious college admissions. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved January 11, 2004, from <http://chronicle.com/prm/daily/2004/01/2004011401n.htm>
- Schmidt, P., & Selingo, J. (2002, December 13). A Supreme Court showdown. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A20-A26.
- Schwartz, B. (1988). *Behind Bakke: Affirmative action and the Supreme Court*. New York: New York University Press.
- Selingo, J. (1999, December 3). A quite end to the use of race in college admissions in Florida. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved August 31, 2001 from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v46/i15/15a03101.htm>

- Selingo, J. (2002, December 3). Relief and uncertainty follow U. S. Supreme Court's decision to hear 2 affirmative-action cases. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved December 3, 2002, from <http://chronicle.com/daily/2002/12/2002120301n.htm>
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Shapiro, H. T. (1998). University presidents then and now. In W. G. Bowen & H. T. Shapiro (Eds.), *Universities and their leadership* (pp. 65-99). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Singer, B. J. (1999). *Pragmatism, rights and democracy*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Smedley, A. (1993). *Race in North America: Origins and evolution of a worldview*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror*. New York: Little, Brown.
- Terenzini, P. T., Cabrera, A. F., Colbeck, C. L., Bjorklund, S. A., & Parente (2001). Racial and ethnic diversity in the classroom: Does it promote learning? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72(5), 509-531.
- Thomas, M. (2001). Civil society's cross-national response to affirmative action. In B. Lindsay & M. J. Justiz (Eds.), *The quest for equity in higher education* (pp. 257-272). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Thompson, L. (2001). *A history of South Africa* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Thompson, F., & Zumeta, W. (2001). Effects of key state policies on private colleges and universities: Sustaining private-sector capacity in the face of the higher education access challenge. *Economics of Education Review*, 20(6), 517-531.

Thornberry, M. C. (1983). Affirmative action: History of an attempt to realize greater equality. In J. C. Foster & M. C. Segers (Eds.), *Evasive equality: Liberalism, affirmative action and social change in America* (pp. 45-53). Port Washington, NY: Associated Faculty Press.

Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1986). *The transformational leader*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Tierney, W. G., & Chung, J. K. (2002). Affirmative action in a post-Hopwood era. In W. A. Smith, P. G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crises in American higher education* (Rev. ed.), (pp. 271-283). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Retrieved May 30, 2003, from <http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/vii.html>

Trent, W. T. (1991). Student affirmative action in higher education: Addressing underrepresentation. In P. G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crises in American higher education*, (pp. 107-132). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Tutu, D. (1999). No future without forgiveness. *New Perspectives Quarterly*, 16, 29-30.

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

United States Commission on Civil Rights (1977, October). *Statement on affirmative action*. Retrieved May 30, 2003, from <http://www.usccr.gov/aaction/>

Unterhalter, E. (2000). Education, citizenship and difference in the South African transition: Policy, politics and practice. *The Curriculum Journal*, 11(1), 69-85.

Van Niekerk, D., Van der Walldt, G., & Jonker, A. (2001). *Governance, politics, and policy in South Africa*. Cape Town, South Africa: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.

Vergnani, L. (2001, April 21). Moving South Africa's universities beyond educational apartheid. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A52-A54.

Wagner, L. (1989). National policy and institutional development. In O. Fullerton (Ed.), *Access and institutional change* (pp. 149-162). Bristol, PA: Open University Press.

Walters, E. (2002). Institutional commitment to diversity and multiculturalism through institutional transformation: A case study of Olivet College. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 3(4), 333-350.

Weber, L. (1999). Survey of the main challenges facing higher education at the millennium. In W. Z. Hirsch & L. Weber, (Eds.), *Challenges facing higher education at the millennium* (pp. 3-17). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

- Weber, R. P. (1985). *Basic content analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Welsh, D., & Savage, M. (1978). The university in divided societies: The case of South Africa. In H. W. Van der Merwe & D. Welsh (Eds.), *The future of the university in southern Africa* (pp. 130-147). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Wetzel, J., O'Toole, D., & Peterson, S. (1998). An analysis of student enrollment demand. *Economics of Education Review*, 17(1), 47-54.
- Wildavsky, A. B. (1979). *Speaking truth to power: The art and craft of policy analysis*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Willingham, W. W. (1970). *Free-access higher education*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.
- Wilson, I. E. (2001). Judicial and legal perspectives on student affirmative action in higher education. In B. Lindsay & M. J. Justiz (Eds.), *The quest for equity in higher education* (pp. 33-62). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Wolcott, H. (1977). *Teachers versus technocrats: An educational innovation in anthropological perspective*. Oregon City: OR: University of Oregon Press.
- Woods, D. R. (1999). Overcoming apartheid in South African universities: Differential access and exchange. In K. Alexander & V. Williams (Eds.), *The 1999 Oxford International Round Table on Education Policy* (pp. 127-136). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Worden, N. (2000). *The making of modern South Africa* (3rd. ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Young, J. R. (2003, October 7). Researchers charge racial bias on SAT. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved October 7, 2003, from <http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v50/i07/07a03401.htm>

## Vita

Marty Z. Khan

### EDUCATION

Doctor of Education	Educational Leadership — 2004. University of North Florida, Jacksonville, Florida
Master of Science	International Relations — 1984. Troy State University, Troy, Alabama (European Campus—Wiesbaden, Germany)
Bachelor of Arts	Economics — 1980. Hunter College, New York, New York

### EXPERIENCE

Acting Inspector General	June 2002 to present. University of North Florida, Jacksonville, Florida
Internal Auditor	June 1996 – June 2002. University of North Florida, Jacksonville, Florida
Senior Internal Auditor	September 1987 – June 1996. United States Government, Washington, D. C.
Political Officer	1987 – present. United States Air Force Reserves. Current Rank: Major